



R  
CLASS 213.37 BOOK 5a

DEMCO

FOR  
Do Not T

NORTH-WESTERN COLLEGE  
LIBRARY

Accession No. 14963 Date 77n '18

Given by LECTURE FUND


E. M. RYHER

Librarian

/R.913.37SA5>C1/



5.6



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation







14963

A COMPANION  
TO  
LATIN STUDIES



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

London: FETTER LANE, E.C.

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER



Edinburgh: 100, PRINCES STREET

Berlin: A. ASHER AND CO.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS

New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

*All rights reserved*



A COMPANION  
TO  
LATIN STUDIES

EDITED

FOR THE SYNDICS OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BY

SIR JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A.,

Hon. Litt.D., Dublin ; Hon. LL.D., Edinburgh, and Athens ;  
Fellow of St John's College, and Public Orator  
in the University of Cambridge

WITHDRAWN

SECOND EDITION


CESTERLE LIBRARY, NOV  
NAPERVILLE, IL 60540  
WITHDRAWN

CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1913

*First Edition 1910*

*Second Edition 1912*





913.37  
Sa5

14963

## PREFACE.

THE general plan of the *Companion to Latin Studies*, now published by the Syndics of the University Press, corresponds to that of the *Companion to Greek Studies*, which appeared in 1905, under the editorship of Mr Whibley, and attained a second edition in the following year. The aim of the present work is to supply in a single volume such information (apart from that contained in Histories and Grammars) as would be most useful to the student of Latin literature. It has been produced by the co-operation of twenty-seven contributors. It contains articles on the Geography and Ethnology of Italy, and on the Topography of Rome; on Fauna and Flora; on Roman Chronology, with Chronological Tables extending from the foundation of Rome to the death of Justinian in 565 A.D.; and on the Religion of the Romans, Etruscans, and other Italic communities. The chapter on Private Antiquities is supplemented by an article on Roman Education. That on Public Antiquities, which fills a large part of the volume, is divided into no less than sixteen articles. These include a full description of the development of the Roman Constitution, a review of Roman Law adapted to the requirements of classical students, together with articles on Finance and Population and Orders of Society, on Colonies, on the Municipal and Provincial systems (with a survey of all the Roman Provinces), on Industry and Commerce, on Roads and Travel, on Measures, Weights, and Money, on the Army and the Navy (with a historical sketch of the rise of Roman sea-power), and, finally, on Public Games and on Theatres. Roman Art is treated under the five headings of Architecture, Sculpture, Terracottas, Gems, and Painting and Mosaic; Literature under the three divisions of (1) Poetry to the end of the Augustan age, (2) Post-Augustan

Poetry, and (3) Prose, from Cato, the Censor of 184 B.C., to Cassiodorus, who ceased to be the Secretary of the Ostrogothic dynasty in 536 A.D. The same chapter includes a sketch of Roman Philosophy, and of Roman Medicine ending with Galen. The next chapter deals with the three cognate subjects of Epigraphy, Palaeography, and Textual Criticism; while the concluding chapter is reserved for the Languages of Italy, the Metres of the Classical Latin poets, and the History of Latin Scholarship beginning with the Roman Age and ending with the recent foundation of the Society for the Promotion of Roman (or Latin) Studies, which is also the aim of the present volume.

References to Latin authors have been inserted in the text or notes, whenever it seemed specially desirable. Latin words are here spelt in accordance with the system now generally approved, *i* being used for *j*, and *u* for *v*, but the older spelling is often retained in cases where proper names, such as Jupiter or Minerva, form part of an English sentence. Each of the articles ends with a Bibliography, which, in no case, pretends to be exhaustive, being limited, in fact, to a list of such works as appear likely to be most useful to students who are more familiar with English than with any other language. The topics treated in each chapter are set forth in a full Table of Contents, while the use of the work is further facilitated by Indexes of proper names and of Latin words or phrases.

Plans, views, and reproductions of works of ancient art, have been carefully selected and inserted in those articles in which illustration seems most necessary. The thanks of the Syndics are due to the Marchese Persichetti, one of the Government Inspectors of Antiquities in Italy, for a photograph of the Roman relief representing a funeral procession, now preserved at Aquila degli Abruzzi (p. 182), and to the authorities of the British Museum for permission to copy the famous Cameo of Augustus which forms the frontispiece of Mr A. H. Smith's *Catalogue of*



*Gems* (p. 587). Their thanks are also due to the following publishers for granting the use of blocks or for permitting the reproduction of illustrations contained in their publications:— to Karl Baedeker of Leipzig for a reprint of the maps of Ancient Rome and the Roman Forum prepared by Dr Christian Huelsen, for many years one of the able Secretaries of the German Imperial Archaeological Institute in Rome; to Mr Batsford (publisher of Anderson and Spiers' *Architecture of Greece and Rome*); to Messrs Adam and Charles Black (publishers of Middleton's *Remains of Ancient Rome*); to Messrs Engelmann of Leipzig and the Macmillan Co., New York (publishers of various editions of Mau's *Pompeii*); and to R. Oldenbourg of Munich (publisher of Baumeister's *Denkmäler*). In the illustrations to the article on Epigraphy, seven of the inscriptions have been reproduced on a smaller scale from Ritschl's *Priscae Latinitatis Monumenta Epigraphica*, and eight from Hübner's *Exempla Scripturae Epigraphicae*, the two great repertories of facsimiles from the inscriptions of Republican and Imperial Rome. In the article on Palaeography the specimens, consisting of a few lines each, are almost exclusively taken from MSS of Classical authors; two of these are extracted from the large plates in Chatelain's admirable *Paléographie des classiques latins*. Except in the case of some of the coins, the source of each cut is added to its title.

The article on Fauna, written in German by Hofrath Otto Keller, the editor of Horace and the author of *Die antike Tierwelt* (1910), has been translated into English by the editor, whose translation had the advantage of being revised, in March, 1907 by two eminent zoologists. For valuable aid in revising the article on Roman Architecture written by the late Mr Clement Gutch, the editor is indebted to Mr A. B. Cook, University Reader in Classical Archaeology.

J. E. S.

October, 1910.

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

A SECOND edition having been called for within two years of publication, it has not been deemed advisable to make any substantial changes, but suggestions on points of detail have been duly considered, and, so far as possible, adopted.

In the article on War, space has been found for a fuller treatment of 'siege-craft and artillery' by the use of smaller type on pages 479 to 481. The Bibliographies in general have been revised, and brought up to date, without any alteration in their aim: they are intended, as before, for the guidance of the student and not for the satisfaction of the specialist. Maps of Italy and the Roman Empire have not been added, as it is assumed that all who are likely to use this book will have at hand a good Classical Atlas.

Four of the illustrations are different from those in the first edition. The thanks of the Syndics are due to Messrs Macmillan for permission to reproduce the 'Diagram of an ancient plough', on p. 215, from one of the later issues of Mr Page's edition of Virgil's *Bucolics and Georgics*, and to Mr Batsford for leave to borrow the view of the 'Interior of the Pantheon', on p. 542, from the fifth edition of Mr Banister Fletcher's *History of Architecture*. The 'Catapulta' on p. 481 is copied in outline from one of the coloured illustrations in Oberst Schramm's pamphlet on Greek and Roman Artillery published at Metz in 1910, while the 'Tuscan column, found at Pompeii', on p. 525, has been drawn on a small scale from the collotype in the *Römische Mitteilungen* for 1902.

The last three sections of the article on Fauna have been revised by the Rev. A. H. Cooke, late Fellow of King's. The article on Architecture has been once more revised by Mr A. B. Cook, with the aid of suggestions received from Mr R. Phené Spiers. The thanks of the editor are due to all who, in these and in other ways, have kindly aided him in preparing the present edition.

J. E. S.

October, 1912.

# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

### GEOGRAPHY AND ETHNOLOGY OF ITALY.

#### I. 1. GEOGRAPHY OF ITALY. By SIR JOHN SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A., Public Orator.

SECTION	PAGE
1 Italy . . . . .	1
2 Italy and Greece . . . . .	2
3 Northern Italy. Alpine passes. Lakes and rivers . . . . .	2
4 Central Italy. Umbria . . . . .	4
5 Etruria . . . . .	5
6 Sabini . . . . .	5
7 Picenum . . . . .	5
8 Vestini. Marrucini. Paeligni. Marsi . . . . .	6
9 Latium. Rome . . . . .	6
10, 11 Campania, p. 7. Samnium . . . . .	8
12 Southern Italy. Apulia . . . . .	8
13, 14 Calabria. Lucania . . . . .	9
15 The land of the Bruttii . . . . .	10
16 Sicily. Mountains, rivers, and cities. Messana. Syracuse . . . . .	11
17 Sardinia. Corsica . . . . .	13

*For the Roman Provinces and their boundaries, see §§ 590—623, pp. 401—409.*

#### I. 2. ETHNOLOGY OF ITALY. By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, Sc.D., F.B.A., Disney Professor of Archaeology.

18 Physical characteristics . . . . .	14
19 Climatic laws . . . . .	16
20, 21 Indo-European peoples . . . . .	17—19
22 The Balkan and the Spanish peninsulas . . . . .	19
23 Italy . . . . .	20
24 Aborigines . . . . .	21
25 Tyrseni . . . . .	22
26 Celts . . . . .	22
27 Ligurians . . . . .	24
28 The Credibility of History. Archaeological evidence . . . . .	24
29 The Ligurians of Roman times, plebeians. Rome and Latium . . . . .	27
30—35 The Sabines, patricians. Evidence from the <i>flamines</i> . Three forms of marriage, p. 30. Disposal of the dead. Armature, p. 31. Language . . . . .	32
36 Campania . . . . .	33
37—39 Southern Italy . . . . .	33



I. 3. TOPOGRAPHY OF ROME. By THOMAS ASHBY, D.Litt.,  
Director of the British School at Rome, formerly Craven Fellow  
in the University of Oxford.

SECTION	PAGE
40 Palatine . . . . .	35
41 Septimontium . . . . .	35
42 'Servian' Wall . . . . .	37
43 Buildings under Appius Claudius etc. . . . .	38
44, 45 Iulius Caesar. Augustus . . . . .	39
46, 47 Tiberius. Caligula. Claudius. Nero . . . . .	40
48, 49 Vespasian. Titus. Domitian. Nerua . . . . .	41
50, 51 Trajan. Hadrian. M. Aurelius. Sept. Seuerus. Caracalla . . . . .	42
51 Aurelian. Diocletian. Maxentius. Constantine . . . . .	43
52 Private buildings . . . . .	43
53 Forum Romanum. Prehistoric cemetery, p. 44. Lapis niger. Iulius Caesar. Discoveries in central area . . . . .	45
54 Palatine excavations of 1907—12 . . . . .	46

## CHAPTER II.

### FAUNA AND FLORA.

II. 1. FAUNA. By Hofrath OTTO KELLER, Ph.D., Tübingen and  
Bonn, late Professor of Classical Philology in the University of Prague.

#### A. MAMMALS.

55 Quadrumana. Dermoptera. Insectivora . . . . .	48
56 Carnivora . . . . .	48
57 Rodentia . . . . .	51
58 Ruminantia . . . . .	52
59 Pachydermata . . . . .	53
60 Cetacea . . . . .	54

#### B. BIRDS.

61, 62 Accipitres. Passeres. Striges . . . . .	55
63 Picariae. Psittaci . . . . .	56
64, 65 Columbæ. Gallinae . . . . .	57
66—68 Grallatores. Limicolæ. Anseres . . . . .	58

#### C. AMPHIBIA AND REPTILES.

69—71 Testudinata. Batrachia. Sauria . . . . .	59
72 Ophidia . . . . .	60
73 D. FISHES . . . . .	60

#### E. INVERTEBRATES.

74 Anellida. Crustacea. Arachnida . . . . .	62
75—77 Insecta. Orthoptera. Diptera, p. 62. Lepidoptera. Hymenoptera, p. 63. Coleoptera . . . . .	64
78—80 Mollusca, p. 64. Cephalopoda. Gastropoda . . . . .	65

II. 2. FLORA. By Sir WILLIAM TURNER THISELTON-DYER, K.C.M.G.,  
C.I.E., F.R.S., Honorary Student of Christ Church, Oxford, Hon.  
Sc.D. Cambridge, late Director of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew.

SECTION	PAGE
81 Scope of the article. Virgil and Ovid, Horace and Martial . . . . .	66
82, 83 Native Trees, p. 67. Native Shrubs . . . . .	69
84, 85 Bee-plants. Wild Flowers and Garlands . . . . .	70
86—88 Food-crops, p. 71. Pulses, p. 73. Fodder Plants . . . . .	74
89, 90 Fruits, p. 74. Nuts . . . . .	77
91—93 Pot-herbs, p. 78. Mushrooms. Seasonings . . . . .	81
94 Garden-plants . . . . .	82
95 Drugs . . . . .	84
96 Dyes . . . . .	85
97, 98 Fibre-plants, p. 85. Reeds, etc. . . . .	86
99 Asiatic plant-products . . . . .	87

CHAPTER III.

HISTORY.

III. 1. CHRONOLOGY. By J. S. REID, Litt.D., Professor of  
Ancient History.

100 Controversies on early Roman Chronology . . . . .	90
101 Inconsistencies in the ancient historians . . . . .	90
102 Further evidence . . . . .	91
103—106 The Roman Calendar, p. 91. The Roman year, probably of lunar origin. The year of 365½ days, p. 92. The cycle of four years averaging 366¼ days . . . . .	93
107—109 Correction of the Calendar, p. 93. The twelve months. The intercalary month . . . . .	94
110 Kalends, Nones, and Ides . . . . .	94
111 The Pontifices and the Calendar . . . . .	95
112 The <i>lex Acilia</i> and earlier enactments . . . . .	96
113—116 <i>Dies Fasti, Nefasti</i> , etc. . . . .	96
117 <i>Nundinum</i> . . . . .	98
118—121 Confusion of the Calendar. Caesar's reform, p. 99. Inter- calation abolished. Details of the reform . . . . .	100
122 Misinterpretation of <i>quarto quoque anno</i> . . . . .	100
123 Controversy on 'the moveable <i>dies intercalaris</i> ' . . . . .	101
124 Post-Augustan alterations . . . . .	101
125—127 Roman methods of determining historic dates, p. 101. Determination of a few leading dates . . . . .	102
128, 129 Preservation of records . . . . .	102
130—133 <i>Fasti</i> , p. 103. Their credibility, p. 104. Sources of dis- crepancies . . . . .	105
134—140 Estimates of the age of the city, p. 105. Various treat- ment of 333, 324, 309, 301 B.C., p. 106. The system of Diodorus. Causes of confusion. Attempted adjustments, p. 107. 'Years of anarchy' . . . . .	108

SECTION	PAGE
141 Chief use of a sound system of Roman chronology . . .	108
142, 143 Evidence from eclipses, etc. . . . .	109
144 Changes in the day for entry on magistracies . . . .	110
145, 146 Difficulty of determining points of departure . .	110
147, 148 The meaning of <i>saeculum</i> , p. 111. <i>Ludi saeculares</i> .	112

### III. 2. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

149 The Monarchy . . . . .	114
150 From the foundation of the Republic to the Decemvirate .	114
151 From the fall of the Decemviri to the capture of Veii . .	115
152 From the capture of Veii to the Latin war . . . . .	116
153 Latin and Samnite wars . . . . .	117
154 From the end of the Samnite wars to the First Punic war .	118
155—157 First Punic war, p. 119. Second Punic war . . . .	121
158—160 From the end of the Second Punic (p. 122) to the Third Punic war. . . . .	123
161 From the Third Punic war to the tribunate of Ti. Gracchus .	124
162—164 The Age of the Gracchi. From the death of C. Gracchus to the sixth consulship of Marius, p. 125. From the suppression of Saturninus to the end of the Social war . . . . .	127
165—167 Sulla and the Marian party, p. 127. From Sulla's death (p. 128) to Caesar's first consulship . . . . .	129
168—170 From Caesar's first consulship to his war with the Pom- peians, p. 130. From the crossing of the Rubicon to the Triumvirate, p. 131. From the battle of Philippi to the death of Antonius . . . . .	132
171 From the battle of Actium to the establishment of the Empire .	133
172—175 The reign of Augustus . . . . .	133
176—180 Tiberius, p. 136 f. Gaius. Claudius, p. 137. Nero . .	138
181 From the fall of Nero to the last year of Vespasian . . .	139
182, 183 Titus and Domitian, p. 139. Nerva and Trajan . . .	140
184, 185 Hadrian, p. 140. Antoninus Pius. M. Aurelius and L. Verus . . . . .	141
186—188 From Commodus to Septimius Severus, p. 142. From Caracalla (p. 142)...to the capture of Valerian by the Persians .	143
189, 190 The era of confusion. The reign of Diocletian . . .	144
191—193 From Constantine to Julian, p. 145. From the murder of Jovian to the death of Theodosius . . . . .	146
194, 195 From the death of Theodosius to the death of Attila,... and the death of Justinian . . . . .	147

## CHAPTER IV.

### RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY.

By W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Lincoln  
College, Oxford.

#### A. THE RELIGION OF THE ROMANS.

196—198 Local (p. 149). Ancient . . . . .	150
199 Numina in Nature . . . . .	150



SECTION	PAGE
200 Religion of the family and farm . . . . .	151
201—205 Religion of the State. Priesthoods, p. 152. Deities, p. 153. <i>Di indigetes</i> , p. 154. <i>Di Manes</i> . <i>Di nouensiles</i> . . . . .	155
206—210 Holy Places, p. 156. Ritual of worship . . . . .	157
211, 212 Decay of the State religion, and its revival by Augustus . . . . .	159
B. CULTS IN OTHER ITALIAN COMMUNITIES.	
213—216 Latium (Falerii, Praeneste, Aricia), p. 161 f. Samnium (Agnone). Umbria (Iguvium) . . . . .	163
C. THE RELIGION OF THE ETRUSCANS.	
217—219 Their deities, p. 165. <i>Disciplina Etrusca</i> . . . . .	166
220 D. THE ROMAN CALENDAR . . . . .	169

## CHAPTER V.

### PRIVATE ANTIQUITIES.

V. 1—8. By F. H. MARSHALL, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer of Emmanuel College, late Assistant in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum.

221 V. 1. A TABLE OF THE RELATIONSHIPS OF A MAN . . . . .	173
222—224 V. 2. ROMAN NAMES. Men. Women. Change of name, p. 174. Slaves. Freedmen . . . . .	175

#### V. 3. BIRTH, MARRIAGE, AND DEATH.

225 Birth . . . . .	175
226 Marriage . . . . .	176
227, 228 Death and burial, p. 179. Monuments . . . . .	183

#### V. 4. THE POSITION OF WOMEN.

##### A. UNDER THE REPUBLIC.

229, 230 Legal position. Actual position, p. 184. Historical development. Position at the end of the Republic . . . . .	185
--	-----

##### B. UNDER THE EMPIRE.

231—236 Legal position, p. 186. Legislation of Augustus. Women in the literature of the early Empire, p. 187. Women and religion. Their political influence. Women of conspicuous excellence, p. 188. Amusements and occupations. Summary . . . . .	189
--	-----

#### V. 5. DRESS.

237—239 Earliest Roman dress, p. 190. Dress of men in later times. The <i>toga</i> , p. 191. Other garments worn by men . . . . .	194
240 Women's garments . . . . .	195
241, 242 Head-dress of men. Head-dress of women . . . . .	197
243 Coverings for the feet . . . . .	198
244 Ornaments . . . . .	198

## V. 6. DAILY LIFE.

SECTION	PAGE
245 A. DIVISION OF TIME . . . . .	200
B. TOWN-LIFE.	
246—251 Morning and afternoon occupations, p. 246f. The bath, p. 204. Meals and food, p. 205. Arrangement of a <i>triclinium</i> , p. 206. Wines, p. 207. The streets of Rome . . . . .	207
C. TRAVELLING.	
252 Favourite resorts in Italy. Mode of travelling . . . . .	208
D. COUNTRY-LIFE.	
253 Country-life under the Empire . . . . .	211

## V. 7. AGRICULTURE.

254—257 Importance of agriculture in Roman history. Land and climate, p. 212. Development of Roman husbandry, p. 213. Estates . . . . .	214
258—261 Fruits and crops, p. 214. The preparation of the soil, p. 215. Sowing and harvest, p. 216. Rearing of animals . . . . .	214

## V. 8. HOUSE AND FURNITURE.

262 Early Italian houses . . . . .	217
263 Roman house of historic times. Early Roman house. The <i>atrium</i> . . . . .	219
264 The Graeco-Roman house . . . . .	219
265—267 Upper stories, p. 221. A Roman house seen from without and from within, p. 222f. Wall decoration . . . . .	223
268 Insulae . . . . .	223
269 Furniture . . . . .	224

## V 9. EDUCATION. By WILLIAM MURISON, M.A., Aberdeen.

270—273 Four periods. First period ending <i>c.</i> 250 B.C. (p. 226). Parental training, p. 227. Schools . . . . .	228
274—277 Second period, <i>c.</i> 250—100 B.C. Literary instruction, p. 228. Rhetorical schools. Physical training. Dancing and music . . . . .	229
278, 279 Third period, <i>c.</i> 100 B.C.—100 A.D. (p. 229). Greek nurses. Paedagogi . . . . .	230
280—284 Schools and school-buildings. School hours, p. 230. Discipline. Remuneration of teachers, p. 231. Holidays . . . . .	232
285 Education of girls . . . . .	232
286 Elementary education. Reading. Writing, p. 232. Calculation . . . . .	233
287 'Secondary' education. Grammar. Elucidation of the poets. Composition . . . . .	233
288, 289 Rhetoric. <i>Progymnasmata</i> . Formal rhetoric. <i>Declamatio</i> , p. 234. Studying abroad . . . . .	235
290, 291 Fourth period, decadence, <i>c.</i> 100—400 A.D. State-endow- ment and State-control . . . . .	235
292 Musical instruments . . . . .	236

V. 10. BOOKS AND WRITING. By M. R. JAMES, Litt.D., F.B.A.,  
Provost of King's College.

SECTION	PAGE
293 <i>liber. libri lintei</i> . . . . .	237
294, 295 <i>Papyrus</i> . The <i>papyrus</i> roll, p. 237. <i>pugillares. codices</i> . Parchment . . . . .	238
296 <i>umbilicus</i> (p. 238). <i>lora. paenula</i> . . . . .	239
297 <i>capsae</i> and <i>plutei. index</i> or <i>titulus</i> , p. 239. <i>armarium</i> . . . . .	240
298 Writing materials . . . . .	240
299 Trade in books. Prices of books. Libraries . . . . .	240
300, 301 Illustration of books. Illustrated codices . . . . .	241 f

CHAPTER VI.

PUBLIC ANTIQUITIES.

VI. 1. THE ROMAN CONSTITUTION. By J. S. REID, Litt.D.

302 The unbroken evolution of Roman constitutional history . . . . .	243
303 <i>imperium</i> . . . . .	243
304—307 Early Roman institutions. The <i>rex</i> (p. 244). The <i>gentes</i> , <i>patricii, clientes</i> , p. 246; the <i>plebs</i> . . . . .	247
308—310 The three original tribes, p. 247. The <i>curiae</i> . The Senate . . . . .	248
311 Survival of ancient offices . . . . .	249
312 The new tribes, p. 249. <i>tribus urbanae</i> and <i>rusticae</i> . . . . .	250
313—315 The centurial organisation, p. 251. The <i>equites</i> . The aim of the centurial system . . . . .	252
316 The overthrow of the monarchy. Three new principles: (1) limitation of tenure, (2) joint tenure of office, (3) political powers assigned to the centuries . . . . .	253
317 Peculiarities of Roman assemblies . . . . .	253
318 Retention of ancient customs . . . . .	254
319 Some characteristics of Roman institutions . . . . .	255
320 The dictator . . . . .	255
321—323 The 'First Secession' and the <i>tribuni plebis</i> , p. 256. Their <i>ius auxilii</i> . Their <i>sacrosancta potestas</i> . Mode of election . . . . .	257
324 The Decemvirate. The 'Twelve Tables,' p. 258. The over- throw of the Decemvirs. The Valerio-Horatian laws . . . . .	259
327 The evolution of the magistracies and the struggle of the plebeians for admission to them. The <i>lex Canuleia. tribuni</i> <i>militares consulari potestate</i> . . . . .	260
328 The office of censor instituted, 444 B.C. The quaestors raised to four, 421 B.C. . . . .	260
329—332 Constitutional agitation prior to the Licinio-Sextian laws of 368 B.C. The first plebeian consul, 367 B.C. The office of curule aedile instituted. The plebeians and the consulship . . . . .	261
333 The plebeians and the various priestly offices . . . . .	262
334 The gradual liberation of the assemblies from patrician control. <i>Lex Publilia</i> on <i>patrum auctoritas</i> . . . . .	262
335 The <i>lex Hortensia</i> of 287 B.C. . . . .	263

SECTION	PAGE
336 The close of the creation of new local tribes . . .	264
337 The democratic reform of the <i>comitia centuriata</i> . . .	264
338 Constitutional measures prior to the age of the Gracchi. The <i>lex Flaminia</i> of 232 B.C. The <i>lex Aelia</i> and <i>lex Fufia</i> of 156 B.C. The <i>lex Calpurnia repetundarum</i> , 149 B.C. . .	265
339, 340 Tiberius Gracchus, 133 B.C. Characteristics of the new era . . .	266
341—344 Gaius Gracchus, 123, 122 B.C. (p. 266). His legislation on the allies. His reconstitution of the <i>equites</i> . His other measures, p. 267. His scheme for the colonies . . .	268
345 The <i>senatus consultum ultimum</i> . . .	269
346 Further legislation prior to the Social War . . .	269
347 The process of conferring the citizenship on the Latins and Italians, 90—70 B.C. . .	269
348—350 Sulla, p. 269. <i>quaestiones perpetuae</i> . Administration by magistrates. Increase in the number of quaestors. The Senate . . .	270
351—353 70—50 B.C. (59—57 B.C.; 56—52 B.C.) . . .	271
I Jan. 49 B.C. . .	272
354 Details of Republican institutions. Principles affecting magistracies . . .	272
355 <i>potestas</i> and <i>imperium</i> . . .	273
356 The observance of <i>auspices</i> . . .	273
357 Magisterial edicts . . .	274
358 Distribution of magisterial duties . . .	274
359—361 Insignia of office. Qualifications for office. <i>cursus honorum</i> , p. 275. Tenure of office . . .	276
362—366 Duties of the consul (p. 276), praetor, censor (p. 277), aediles, quaestors . . .	278
367 Tribunes, p. 279. Their <i>sacrosancta potestas</i> . . .	280
368 <i>interregnum</i> . . .	280
369 Minor functionaries . . .	281
370—374 The Senate. Its supremacy in legislation, foreign affairs (p. 281), finances. Other duties of the Senate, p. 282. Procedure in the Senate . . .	283
375—378 The citizens and their assemblies, p. 283. The protection of their rights. Legislation, p. 284. Criminal jurisdiction . .	285
379 Constitutional development resumed. The domination of Caesar . . .	285
380 From the death of Caesar to the second Triumvirate, p. 285. Octavian. The name <i>imperator</i> . . .	286
381—384 The new name, <i>Augustus</i> . The <i>tribunicia potestas</i> . <i>proconsulare imperium maius</i> . <i>pontifex maximus</i> . The basis of imperial power, p. 287. The title <i>princeps</i> . The supposed 'dyarchy' . . .	288
385 Influence of the changed polity on the tribunes (p. 288), consuls, praetors, quaestors (p. 289), <i>uigintisexviri</i> . . .	290
386, 387 The <i>cursus honorum</i> regulated by the emperor. Freedom of election restricted . . .	290
388 The duties of the Senate . . .	290
389 The rest of the community . . .	291



SECTION	PAGE
390—393 New elements. The army. Finance, p. 292. Emperor-worship. Legislation, p. 293. Administration of the law . . .	294
394—396 The grant of citizenship, p. 294. Cities, princes, and peoples. Provinces . . .	295
397—399 Maintenance of order in Rome, p. 295. Jurisdiction of the <i>praefectus urbi</i> , the <i>praefectus uigilum</i> , and the <i>praefecti praetorio</i> , p. 296. Nomination of new municipal officers . . .	297
400 Organisation of imperial business . . .	297
401—403 Diocletian and Constantine. The sequel. The end . . .	298

VI. 2. LAW. By J. S. REID, Litt.D.

404 Roman law for classical students . . .	299
405 The primitive age before the Decemvirate . . .	299
406—414 Subsequent legislation. (a) General features of the expansion of Roman law, p. 300. No clear distinction between magistrate and judge. Force of public opinion, p. 301. Power of the <i>pontifices</i> . Later <i>iuris consulti</i> . Effect of external influences, p. 302. Extension of the sphere of Roman law. The 'Twelve Tables.' The 'praetor's edict'. . .	303
415—422 (b) Status in relation to law, p. 303. Varieties of status, p. 304. Marriage with or without <i>manus</i> . <i>adoptio</i> , p. 305. <i>adrogatio</i> . <i>emancipatio</i> . <i>emancipatio</i> of slaves, p. 306. <i>tutela</i> . <i>agnatio</i> . <i>cognatio</i> . . .	307
423—428 (c) Property. <i>res Mancipi</i> . <i>res nec Mancipi</i> . <i>mancipatio</i> , p. 308. <i>nexum</i> . The law of debt, p. 309. Primitive <i>traditio</i> of <i>res nec Mancipi</i> . <i>usucapio</i> , <i>dominium</i> , and <i>possessio</i> . <i>usucapio</i> , p. 310. <i>in iure cessio</i> . <i>servitutes</i> . . .	311
429—441 (d) Law of inheritance, p. 311. Later rules of succession. The right of testation. <i>testamentum calatis comitiis</i> , p. 312. <i>testamentum in procinctu</i> . <i>legare</i> . <i>testamentum per aes et libram</i> . Persons entitled to make wills, p. 313. <i>heres</i> and <i>legatarius</i> . <i>heres ex asse</i> . <i>heres secundus</i> or <i>tertius</i> . Rules relating to <i>hereditas</i> and <i>legatum</i> , p. 314. <i>suus heres</i> . <i>legata</i> and <i>fidei commissa</i> . The rights of the heir, p. 315. <i>Lex Papia Poppaea</i> . . .	316
442—448 (e) Contracts. <i>sponsio</i> , p. 316. <i>stipulatio</i> . 'Real' contracts. 'Literal' contracts, p. 317. Obligations arising from consent, or without express consent. Contracts under the Empire . . .	318
449—479 (f) Legal procedure, p. 318. <i>legis actiones</i> . <i>actio per sacramentum</i> , p. 319. <i>manum conserere</i> . <i>uindictae</i> . <i>adserere</i> , p. 320. <i>actio per iudicis postulationem</i> , <i>per manus iniectionem</i> . Law of debt, p. 320. <i>actio per pignoris captionem</i> , <i>per con-dictionem</i> . Procedure <i>per formulam</i> , p. 322. <i>decemuiri stlitibus iudicandis</i> . <i>centumuiiri recuperatores</i> , p. 323. <i>iudices</i> and <i>arbitri</i> ; mode of appointment, p. 324. Procedure <i>in iure</i> , p. 325. <i>formula</i> . <i>praescriptio</i> . <i>exceptio</i> , p. 326. <i>praeiudicium</i> . <i>litis contestatio</i> . <i>condemnatio</i> . <i>actio indicati</i> . <i>proscriptio bonorum</i> , p. 327. <i>missio in possessionem</i> . Pecuniary penalties. <i>infamia</i> , p. 328. Punishment of subordinate	

SECTION	PAGE
or supreme judge, p. 329. <i>interdictum</i> , p. 330. Classes of <i>interdicta</i> . Procedure <i>extra ordinem. actio and iudicium</i> . Distinctions between classes of actions, p. 331. Changes under the Empire . . . . .	332
480—497 (g) Criminal law. Comitial and other forms of trial, p. 333. Comitial trial and trial by <i>quaestio</i> . Penalty of death. Sentence of exile. Death-penalty rare under the Republic, p. 334. Trial before the assemblies. Preliminaries to a trial. Details of procedure, p. 335. Composition of the jury, p. 336. Rules of evidence. Verdict. Temporary criminal courts. The <i>quaestiones</i> superseded, p. 337. Trials before the emperor or the Senate. Trials of senators. The right of appeal, p. 338. Penalties under the Empire. Penal servitude. <i>deportatio</i> and <i>relegatio</i> , p. 339. Other penalties. Status of persons punished. Punishment of slaves . . . . .	340
VI. 3. FINANCE. By G. H. STEVENSON, M.A., Fellow and Praelector in Ancient History, University College, Oxford.	
498—501 Financial administration under the Republic, p. 341. The <i>publicani</i> . . . . .	342
502—505 Changes under the Empire, 343. <i>aerarium. fiscus</i> , p. 344. Sources of revenue. The <i>tributum</i> . . . . .	345
506 Public lands in Italy, p. 345. <i>ager publicus</i> . . . . .	346
507—509 Provincial taxation under the Republic, p. 346. <i>decumae. stipendium</i> . . . . .	347
510 Changes in taxation under the Empire . . . . .	348
511, 512 Indirect taxes. <i>portoria. uicesimae</i> . . . . .	349
513 515 Some sources of expenditure. The corn-supply . . . . .	350
516—519 Expenses of government, p. 351. Expenses of army. Other sources of expenditure . . . . .	352
VI. 4—6. By F. H. MARSHALL, M.A.	
VI. 4. POPULATION.	
520—523 A. ROME. Absence of trustworthy statistics, p. 353. Methods of enquiry and their results . . . . .	354
524 525 B. ITALY, p. 353. Density of population . . . . .	356
526 C. ROMAN EMPIRE . . . . .	356
VI. 5. ORDERS OF SOCIETY.	
527—530 A. UNDER THE REPUBLIC. Patricians and plebeians. The new aristocracy. The knights, p. 358. The <i>plebs urbana</i> . . . . .	359
531—536 UNDER THE EMPIRE. Senatorial order, p. 359. The knights. The <i>plebs</i> . Freedmen, p. 360. Municipals and provincials . . . . .	361
VI. 6. SLAVES.	
537—541 Sources of supply, p. 362. Prices of slaves. Occupations and numbers, p. 363. Treatment of slaves . . . . .	364

VI. 7—9. By B. W. HENDERSON, M.A., Fellow and Tutor  
of Exeter College, Oxford.

VI. 7. THE ROMAN MUNICIPAL SYSTEM.

SECTION	PAGE
542 The Towns of the Roman State . . . . .	366
543—547 A. <i>Ciues Romani</i> . (1) <i>Coloniae Romanae</i> , (2) <i>Fora</i> , (3) <i>Conciliabula</i> , (4) <i>Municipia</i> (p. 366 f), (5) <i>Praefecturae</i> .	368
548—550 B. <i>Peregrini</i> . (1) <i>Nomen Latinum</i> , (2) <i>Ciuitates liberae</i> (p. 369), (3) <i>Ciuitates stipendiariae</i> . . . . .	370
551—555 The municipal organisation, (A) classes of inhabitants (p. 371); (B) the local constitution, (1) The Magistrates (p. 372), (2) The Senate ( <i>decuriones</i> or <i>conscripti</i> ), p. 373. (3) The 'People' . . . . .	375
556—558 Municipal finance, p. 375. Control by the central govern- ment, p. 377. Results of the municipal system . . . . .	378
559—563 The <i>Collegia</i> . . . . .	379

VI. 8. COLONIES.

564, 565 Their military character, p. 382. Meaning of <i>colonia</i> .	383
566—569 Kinds of colonies down to 123 B.C. (A) <i>Coloniae ciuium</i> <i>Romanorum</i> (p. 384) and (B) <i>Coloniae Latinae</i> . . . . .	385
569—572 From 123 B.C. to the Empire, p. 386. Causes of coloni- sation, (1) social, (2) military, (3) commercial . . . . .	387
573 The term <i>colonia</i> under the Empire . . . . .	388
574 The method of colonising . . . . .	388

VI. 9. (A) THE ROMAN PROVINCIAL SYSTEM.

575, 576 Meaning of <i>provincia</i> , p. 390. Rome's 'provincial policy.' Self-defence . . . . .	391
577 The age of annexation, 146 B.C. to 14 A.D. . . . .	392
578 The centuries of assimilation, 14 to 106 A.D. . . . .	393
579 Annexation resumed by Trajan 107 A.D. Diocletian . . . . .	393
580 Absence of ordinary motives for annexation . . . . .	393
581 Provincial organisation, <i>lex provinciae</i> . . . . .	395
582 Classes of provinces: (1) public, (2) imperial, (3) procuratorial. Egypt . . . . .	395 f
583, 584 <i>dioceses</i> and <i>conuentus</i> , p. 396. Free towns and client kingdoms . . . . .	397
585 Results of the provincial system. Condition of the provinces under the Republic . . . . .	397
586—589 Causes of improvement under the Empire, p. 398. Pro- vincial councils, p. 399. General prosperity, except in Greece. Qualities necessary for governing alien races. The 'Roman- ising' of the world . . . . .	400

VI. 9. (B) ALPHABETIC LIST OF PROVINCES.  
(WITH DATE OF ACQUISITION, BOUNDARIES, ETC.)

590—623 Achaëa. Africa. The Alpine districts. Arabia. Armenia maior, p. 401. Asia. Assyria. Bithynia and Pontus. Britain.	
--	--

SECTION	PAGE
Cappadocia. Cilicia, p. 402. Crete and Cyrene. Cyprus. Dacia. Egypt. Epirus, p. 403. Galatia. Gaul. Germany, p. 404. Illyricum or Dalmatia. Judaea, p. 405. Lycia and Pamphylia. Macedonia. Mauretania. Mesopotamia. Moesia, p. 406. Noricum. Pannonia. Raetia. Sardinia and Corsica, p. 407. Sicily. Spain. Syria. Thrace . . . . .	408
VI. 10. By R. C. BOSANQUET, M.A., Trinity College, Professor of Classical Archaeology in the University of Liverpool; late Director of the British School at Athens.	
VI. 10. (A) INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE.	
624—627 The regal and early Republican period, p. 409. The later Republican period, p. 410. The Imperial age . . . . .	411
628—631 Trades concerned with food, p. 411. Handicrafts connected with clothing. Workers in leather (p. 412), wood, metal, and clay . . . . .	413
632—643 Local distribution of industries: Rome (p. 414), Etruria, the valley of the Po, Campania (Puteoli and Capua) (p. 414), Spain, Gaul, Britain (p. 415), the Rhine and Danube provinces, the Balkan provinces (p. 416), Greece and the Greek islands, Asia Minor and Cyprus, Syria . . . . .	417
644—648 Overland trade with the Far East. Egypt, Arabia and India, p. 418. North Africa, p. 419. Foreign commerce of Rome, and its economic results . . . . .	420
VI. 10. (B) ROADS AND TRAVEL.	
649—653 Roads. Milestones (p. 421 f). The roads of southern and of northern Italy . . . . .	422
654—658 The beginning of road-making in the provinces, p. 423. Spain. Gaul and Germany, p. 424. Britain, p. 425. The Danube provinces . . . . .	426
659—661 Sea-routes. Routes to the East, p. 426. Roads in Asia Minor, p. 427 f. Egypt and the African provinces . . . . .	428
662 The imperial post . . . . .	429
663—666 Sea-borne trade, p. 430. Inland transport. Private correspondence. Public safety . . . . .	431
667—671 Inns, p. 432. Modes of travel. Travellers, p. 433. Places visited, p. 434. Explorers . . . . .	435
VI. 11, 12. By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, Sc.D., F.B.A.	
VI. 11. ROMAN MEASURES AND WEIGHTS.	
672—679 A. MEASURES. Origin of measures of length and capacity, p. 436. Standards of length. The Roman foot. Divisions of the foot. Itinerary measures, p. 437. Land measures. Measures of capacity . . . . .	438
680—684 B. WEIGHTS. Origin of weight standards. Weights for gold and silver, p. 439. The Roman pound. Subdivisions of the <i>uncia</i> , p. 440. Divisions of the <i>libra</i> . . . . .	441



VI. 12. ROMAN MONEY.

SECTION	PAGE
685—694 The earliest period, p. 441. Bronze coinage, p. 442 f. The <i>as</i> , p. 445. Beginning of coinage. Reduction of the <i>as</i> , p. 447. The <i>as</i> in the late Republic and the Empire . . .	449
695—699 Silver coinage. The <i>nummus</i> , p. 450. The reduction of the <i>denarius</i> . The <i>victoriatas</i> . Later Empire . . .	451
700 Gold coinage . . . . .	451
701—705 Coin types, p. 452. Types on the bronze, copper, brass (p. 453), silver (p. 455) and gold coinage . . . . .	457

VI. 13, 14. WAR.

VI. 13. THE ROMAN ARMY. By E. H. ALTON, M.A.,  
Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.

706—709 The earliest army. The Servian army, p. 458. Armour. The Servian phalanx . . . . .	459
710—712 The manipular system, p. 459. Army of the second century . . . . .	460
713 Roman cavalry of the Republic . . . . .	461
714, 715 Auxiliary forces under the Republic, the <i>socii</i> and <i>cuxiliares</i> . . . . .	461
716—718 The mercenary army. Marius, p. 462. Caesar . . . . .	463
719—721 The standing army of the Empire, p. 463. Changes in the legion . . . . .	464
722 <i>evocati</i> , <i>auxiliarii</i> , <i>frumentarii</i> . . . . .	465
723, 724 Auxiliary forces under the Empire; <i>cohortes auxiliares</i> , <i>cohortes civium</i> . . . . .	466
725—727 Provincial forces. Cavalry, p. 466. <i>equites</i> , <i>pedites</i> <i>singulares</i> . . . . .	467
728, 729 The guards, <i>cohors praetoria</i> , p. 467. <i>Batavi</i> ; <i>equites</i> <i>singulares Augusti</i> , <i>statores Augusti</i> . . . . .	468
730 <i>Cohortes urbanae</i> , <i>cohortes uigilum</i> . . . . .	468
731—738 WEAPONS AND TACTICS . . . . .	468—76
731—733 Weapons and armour, p. 468. The order of march. The order of battle . . . . .	471
734 The battle of Bibracte and the defeat of the Heluetii in 58 B.C. . . . .	472
735 The battle of Cannae, 216 B.C. . . . .	475
736—740 FORTIFICATION AND SIEGE-CRAFT . . . . .	477—81
736, 737 The camp, ( <i>a</i> ) under the Republic, ( <i>b</i> ) under the Empire . . . . .	477
738, 739 Fortification of cities, p. 478. Frontier defences . . . . .	479
740 Siege-craft and artillery . . . . .	479
741—753 MINOR PARTICULARS CONCERNING THE SERVICE. Re- cruiting, p. 482. Terms of service. Pay, p. 483. Commissariat. Training. Works in time of peace, p. 484. Camp life. Military rewards and distinctions. The inferior officers, <i>prin-</i> <i>cipales</i> , p. 485. Superior officers, p. 487. Centurions, p. 488. Medical service . . . . .	489

VI. 14. THE ROMAN NAVY. By W. W. TARN, B.A.,  
Trinity College, Barrister-at-Law.

SECTION		PAGE
754—756	The old navy, p. 489. The commanders. Ships supplied by Italiot towns . . . . .	490
757—759	First Punic war, p. 490. Second Punic war. War with Antiochus, p. 491. Third Punic war. Wars against Mithradates . . . . .	492
760—764	The commanders, p. 492. The crew. The ships, p. 493. The Roman trireme. The quinquereme . . . . .	494
765, 766	The new navy. Pompey. Caesar. The State-fleet revived. Sextus Pompeius, p. 495. Brutus and Cassius. The fiction of a State-fleet comes to an end . . . . .	496
767—771	Octavian, p. 496. The crews. The bireme and the Liburnian. Augustus . . . . .	497
772—776	The imperial standing fleets, p. 498. Commanders. Trierarchs and nauarchs, p. 499. Crews . . . . .	500
777	Roman sea-power . . . . .	500

VI. 15, 16. By J. H. GRAY, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer  
of Queens' College.

VI. 15. ROMAN PUBLIC GAMES (LUDI PUBLICI).

778—785	Early games, p. 501. Increase in their number, p. 502. Different kinds of games . . . . .	503
786—791	Duration of the games, p. 504. <i>instauratio</i> , p. 505. Expenses and management, p. 506. Changes and additions under the Empire . . . . .	507
792—798	<i>ludi scaenici</i> , p. 507. <i>ludi circenses</i> . Gladiatorial displays, p. 508. <i>venationes</i> , p. 509. <i>naumachiae</i> , p. 510. <i>agones</i> . . . . .	511
799	Music. Conclusion . . . . .	511f

VI. 16. THE ROMAN THEATRE.

800	Early temporary theatres . . . . .	513
801—803	Permanent theatres . . . . .	514
804—807	Arrangements of the Roman theatre, p. 517. Assignment of seats. Actors, p. 519. Performance, dresses, and scenery . . . . .	520

CHAPTER VII.

ART.

VII. 1. ARCHITECTURE. By the late CLEMENT GUTCH, M.A.,  
King's College, Classical Lecturer of St John's College.

808—810	Primitive architecture. The earliest remains of walls of 'Cyclopean,' 'Polygonal,' or 'Rectangular' construction, p. 522. Early temples . . . . .	523
811, 812	Characteristics of Roman architecture, p. 523. The arch. Use of concrete . . . . .	524
813	The Tuscan temple and order . . . . .	524

SECTION	PAGE
814—817 Adoption of Greek styles, p. 526. Temple-plans . . . . .	527
818 Circular temples . . . . .	529
819—822 Orders. Roman-Doric, p. 530. Roman-Ionic, p. 531. Roman-Corinthian, p. 533. Composite . . . . .	534
823, 824 Use of columnar architecture . . . . .	535
825 Use of the arch, p. 537 Materials . . . . .	538
826—830 Existing remains of Roman-Doric (p. 539), Roman-Ionic, and Roman-Corinthian temples . . . . .	540
831—834 Triumphal arches, p. 544. Basilicas. Baths, p. 545. Amphitheatres . . . . .	547

VII. 2. SCULPTURE. By A. J. B. WACE, M.A., Fellow of Pembroke College, Lecturer in Ancient History and Archaeology in the University of St Andrews.

835 Early Roman statues . . . . .	550
836 f Portrait busts, p. 552. <i>imagines maiorum</i> . Waxed masks. Marble busts of the Roman Republic . . . . .	553
838, 839 Roman Sculpture under Augustus (p. 553), the Julio- Claudian emperors, the Flavian dynasty (p. 555), Trajan . . . . .	556
839 The rendering of the eye under Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, M. Aurelius, Commodus, Sept. Seuerus . . . . .	557
839, 840 Roman Sculpture under Caracalla, Philippus Arabs (p. 558), Gallienus (p. 559), Constantine . . . . .	561
841 Bronze statues of M. Aurelius, Sept. Seuerus, and 'Theodosius.' Bronze busts of 'Brutus' and Titus . . . . .	561
842 Roman pediments . . . . .	561
842—847 Historical reliefs, p. 561. <i>Ara Pacis Augustae</i> . Arch of Titus, p. 563. Flavian medallions, p. 565. Reliefs from Trajan's forum. Trajan's Column. The Arch at Beneuentum. Panels of the age of Hadrian, p. 567. Base of the Antonine column, p. 569. Panels from an arch of M. Aurelius. The column of M. Aurelius. Reliefs of the Arch of Sept. Seuerus. Relief of Caracalla, p. 570. Frieze of the Arch of Constantine, p. 571. Arch of Galerius. Base of the Obelisk of Theodosius, p. 572. Remains of the column of Arcadius. Decorative reliefs in the Palazzo Spada and the Capitoline Museum . . . . .	573
847 Reliefs on Sarcophagi: (1) mythological subjects, (2) battle scenes, (3) scenes from the life of the deceased . . . . .	573
848 Christian Sarcophagi. Seated statue of Hippolytus. Statuettes of the Good Shepherd. Seated statue of St Peter . . . . .	575
849 Parallel development of purely ornamental work . . . . .	577

VII. 3. TERRACOTTAS. By ARTHUR HAMILTON SMITH, M.A., Trinity College, Keeper of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum.

850 Greek use of terracotta for statuettes . . . . .	578
851 Italian use of terracotta for larger statues . . . . .	579
852—856 Terracotta applied to architecture . . . . .	579
857, 858 Moulded bricks and tiles, and pottery . . . . .	580

## VII. 4. ENGRAVED GEMS. By WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, Sc.D., F.B.A.

SECTION	PAGE
859 Use of precious stones . . . . .	581
860, 861 Engraved gems in Italy. Etruscan gems . . . . .	583
862—864 Roman gems, p. 583. The signet ring. The use of seals . . . . .	584
865 867 Gems under the Empire, 585. Portraits. Ordinary types . . . . .	586
868—870 <i>Grylli</i> . Egyptian deities. Oriental and astrological types . . . . .	586
871, 872 Cameos, p. 586 f. Collections of gems . . . . .	588

VII. 5. PAINTING AND MOSAIC. By F. R. EARP, M.A.,  
formerly Fellow of King's College.

873—875 Magna Graecia, p. 589. Etruria . . . . .	590
876—878 Rome, p. 591. Pompeii and Herculaneum. Existing paintings . . . . .	592
879—892 Mythological subjects, p. 592. Genre, p. 593. Still-life. Landscapes. Portraits, p. 596. Technique etc. . . . .	597
893—897 Mosaic. <i>Opus sectile</i> (p. 598), <i>tessellatum</i> , <i>vermiculatum</i> . . . . .	599
898—900 Use of mosaic for walls as well as for pavements . . . . .	600 f

## CHAPTER VIII.

## VIII. I. LITERATURE.

A. POETRY TO THE END OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE. By the late Professor  
A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D., Fellow of Trinity College.

901, 902 The author's aim, a brief appreciation of the best poets. The early period, 250—100 B.C. . . . .	602
903 Ennius . . . . .	603
904 Drama . . . . .	604
905—908 Plautus, p. 606. <i>Captivi</i> , p. 607. <i>Stichus</i> . <i>Miles Gloriosus</i> . <i>Rudens</i> (p. 608). <i>Amphitryo</i> . . . . .	609
910—912 Terence, p. 609. Afranius . . . . .	611
913 Lucilius . . . . .	611
914, 915 Lucretius . . . . .	612
917—919 Catullus . . . . .	615
920 'Augustan' poetry . . . . .	617
921 923 Virgil, <i>Eclogues</i> (p. 619), <i>Georgics</i> , <i>Aeneid</i> . . . . .	620
924 Horace, p. 621; <i>Sermones</i> , <i>Epistolae</i> , <i>Ars Poetica</i> , <i>Epodes</i> , <i>Odes</i> . . . . .	622
925 Elegiac Poets. Tibullus, p. 623. 'Lygdamus.' Sulpicia . . . . .	624
926 Propertius . . . . .	624
927 Ovid, p. 626; <i>Metamorphoses</i> (p. 627), <i>Ars Amatoria</i> , <i>Heroides</i> (p. 628), <i>Amores</i> , <i>Fasti</i> , <i>Tristia</i> , <i>Ex Ponto</i> . . . . .	629

B. POST-AUGUSTAN POETRY. By WALTER C. SUMMERS, M.A., late  
Fellow of St John's College, Professor of Latin in the University  
of Sheffield.

928, 929 Manilius, p. 629. Phaedrus . . . . .	630
930, 931 Seneca . . . . .	631
932 Persius . . . . .	631



SECTION	PAGE
933—935 Lucan . . . . .	632
936—939 Columella. Calpurnius, p. 634. <i>Aetna</i> . . . . .	635
940, 941 Valerius Flaccus . . . . .	635
943—946 Statius: <i>Thebais</i> (p. 636), <i>Achilleis</i> (p. 637), <i>Silvae</i> . . . . .	638
947, 948 Silius Italicus . . . . .	638
949, 950 Martial . . . . .	639
951, 952 Juvenal . . . . .	641
953 The <i>Peruigilium Veneris</i> . . . . .	642
954 Nemesianus, <i>Eclogues</i> and <i>Cynegetica</i> . . . . .	642
955 Ausonius (p. 643); <i>Mosella</i> . . . . .	644
956 Prudentius . . . . .	644
957 Claudian . . . . .	644
958 Namatian . . . . .	646

C. PROSE FROM CATO TO CASSIODORUS (with general bibliography).

By SIR JOHN SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A.

959 The beginnings of rhythmical prose . . . . .	646
960 Appius Claudius, the censor . . . . .	647
961 Cato, <i>De agri cultura</i> (p. 647), <i>Origines</i> , <i>Orationes</i> . . . . .	648
962 The ' <i>Auctor ad Herennium</i> ' . . . . .	648
963 Varro, <i>De lingua Latina</i> , <i>Rerum Rusticarum libri</i> (p. 649), <i>Saturae Menippeae</i> , <i>Logistorici</i> , <i>Antiquitates</i> , <i>Disciplinae</i> , <i>Imagines</i> . . . . .	650
964—970 Cicero (p. 650); Cicero as an orator, p. 651. His Speeches (pp. 652—654) and their <i>clausulae</i> . . . . .	655
971—973 Rhetorical works, p. 655; Philosophical works, pp. 656— 658; Letters . . . . .	658
974 Caesar: <i>De Analogia</i> , <i>De Bello Gallico</i> , <i>De Bello Ciuili</i> (p. 659); Hirtius: <i>De Bello Gallico viii</i> ; <i>Bellum Alexandrinum</i> ; <i>Bellum Africae</i> ; <i>Bellum Hispaniense</i> . . . . .	660
975 Early Latin Historians. Coelius Antipater, Claudius Quadri- garius, Valerius Antias, Sisenna . . . . .	660
976 Cornelius Nepos (p. 660), <i>De uiris illustribus</i> , etc. . . . .	661
977 Sallust: <i>Bellum Catilinae</i> , <i>Bellum Iugurthinum</i> , etc. . . . .	661
978, 979 The Augustan age, p. 662. Livy . . . . .	662
980 Asconius . . . . .	665
981, 982 Pompeius Trogus, (Justin) . . . . .	665
983 The elder Seneca . . . . .	665
984 Vitruuius . . . . .	666
985, 986 The age of Tiberius: Velleius Paterculus (p. 666), and Valerius Maximus . . . . .	667
987 Q. Curtius Rufus . . . . .	668
988 Pomponius Mela . . . . .	668
989, 990 Celsus, 668. Columella . . . . .	669
991—995 Seneca, p. 669; <i>Dialogi</i> , <i>Apocolocyntosis</i> , <i>De clementia</i> , <i>De beneficiis</i> (p. 670), <i>Epistolae</i> , etc. . . . .	671
996 Petronius . . . . .	672
997 The elder Pliny . . . . .	673
998, 999 Quintilian . . . . .	675

SECTION	PAGE
1000 Frontinus . . . . .	676
1001—1008 Tacitus, <i>Dialogus</i> (p. 667), <i>Agricola</i> , <i>Germania</i> , <i>Historiae Annales</i> ; his authorities (p. 678); his characteristics . . . . .	679
1009 Pliny the younger, p. 680; <i>Panegyricus</i> , <i>Epistolae</i> (p. 681), <i>Correspondence with Trajan</i> . . . . .	682
1014—1017 Suetonius, p. 682. Censorinus. Florus. . . . .	683
1018. 1019 Granius Licinianus, p. 683. <i>Scriptores historiae augustae</i> . . . . .	684
1020 Gaius, <i>Institutiones</i> . . . . .	684
1021. 1022 Fronto, p. 684 f; Gellius . . . . .	685
1023 Apuleius . . . . .	685
1024—1029 Minucius Felix. Tertullian, p. 686 f. Cyprian. Arnobius, p. 687 f. Lactantius. Jerome . . . . .	688
1030—1032 Orosius. Aurelius Victor. Eutropius. Ammianus Marcellinus. Symmachus . . . . .	689
1033, 1034 Ambrose. Augustine . . . . .	690
1035—1037 Macrobius. Seruius, p. 690. Martianus Capella . . . . .	691
1038—1041 Hilary of Poitiers. Sulpicius Seuerus. Saluianus. Sidonius Apollinaris . . . . .	691
1042, 1043 Boëthius, 691; <i>Philosophiae Consolatio</i> . . . . .	692
1044 Cassiodorus, <i>Variae</i> etc. . . . .	692
1045 Priscian, <i>Institutiones Grammaticae</i> . . . . .	692
1046 Benedict and Monte Cassino; Justinian and his code. . . . .	693

VIII. 2. ROMAN PHILOSOPHY. By R. D. HICKS, M.A.,  
Fellow of Trinity College.

1047 Philosophy in Rome a branch of general culture . . . . .	695
1048—1050 Epicureanism; Lucretius (p. 695), matter and void, atoms (p. 696), motion, the world, the soul (p. 697), perception, ethics, the gods, friendship . . . . .	699
1051—1056 Cicero. The New Academy (p. 699). Cicero's philosophic position (p. 700). The criterion of truth: <i>Academica</i> . The end of action: <i>De Finibus</i> (p. 701). Cicero's accuracy . . . . .	702
1057—1067 Three periods of Stoicism. Early Stoicism (p. 702). The criterion of truth. Physics. Pantheism (p. 702). The soul. Ethics (p. 704). Stoicism in its second period. Panaetius (p. 705). Poseidonius. Attitude to the popular religion. Cicero, <i>De Natura Deorum</i> , II (p. 706). <i>De Finibus</i> , III. <i>Prima naturae. Officium</i> (p. 708). Suicide. Social ethics (p. 709). The law of nature. Roman Stoics: Seneca, Epictetus, M. Aurelius (p. 710). Progress towards virtue . . . . .	711

VIII. 3, 4. By the late J. F. PAYNE, M.D., Honorary Fellow  
of Magdalen College, Oxford.

VIII. 3. NATURAL HISTORY AND SCIENCE.

1068. 1069 The <i>Naturalis Historia</i> of Pliny . . . . .	712
1070, 1071 Mathematics, Arithmetic, Geometry . . . . .	713
1072 Astronomy . . . . .	714

VIII. 4. MEDICINE.

SECTION	PAGE
1073—1076 Roman Medicine. Gods of healing . . . . .	715
1076—1080 Introduction of Greek Medicine. Worship of Aesculapius, p. 716. Greek physicians in Rome. Archagathus. Asclepi- ades, p. 717. The methodic school . . . . .	718
1081 The Roman encyclopaedists, p. 718. Varro, Celsus, Pliny . . . . .	719
1082—1085 Galen on Anatomy (p. 720), Physiology (p. 721), Dietetics and Hygiene, Pathology, Diagnosis, Materia Medica, Thera- peutics (p. 722) etc. . . . .	724
1086 Other medical writers in Rome . . . . .	724
1087—1089 The medical profession. Emoluments of physicians, p. 725. Medical education. Archiatri, p. 726. Military medicine . . . . .	727

CHAPTER IX.

EPIGRAPHY, PALAEOGRAPHY, TEXTUAL  
CRITICISM.

IX. I. EPIGRAPHY. By SIR JOHN SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A.

1090 Definition . . . . .	728
1091 Greek origin of the Latin Alphabet, p. 728 f; double consonants, double vowels . . . . .	730
1091—1093 Earliest Latin inscriptions. The <i>Fibula Praenestina</i> , p. 730 f. The Forum inscription, p. 731 f. The 'Duenos' inscription . . . . .	733
1094 <i>Scriptura monumentalis</i> , p. 734. The epitaphs of the Scipios, pp. 734—736. The fully developed lettering of the early Empire . . . . .	737
1095 (1) <i>Scriptura actuariæ</i> , p. 737; (2) <i>cursiva</i> , p. 738; (3) <i>uncialis</i> . . . . .	739
1096 Forms of letters in the several styles . . . . .	742
1097—1100 Numerals, p. 742. Fractions. Ligatures. Sicilicus. Apex. Punctuation . . . . .	743
1101, 1102 The process of making inscriptions. The use of stamps . . . . .	744
1103 The <i>scriptura vulgaris</i> of unprofessional inscriptions . . . . .	744
1104 The Latin of inscriptions. Abbreviations . . . . .	745
1105 Classification of inscriptions (I) inscriptions proper, or <i>tituli</i> ; (II) documents, or <i>acta</i> ; and the subdivisions of each . . . . .	746
1106—1109 (I) Inscriptions proper: (1) epitaphs, p. 746 f; (2) dedica- tory inscriptions, p. 747 f; (3) honorary inscriptions, p. 748 f; (4) inscriptions on public buildings, temples, aqueducts (p. 750), bridges, milestones (p. 751), and boundary stones . . . . .	752
1110—1116 (5) Inscriptions on moveable objects, (i) articles of metal, (a) weights and measures, p. 752; (b) <i>tesserae</i> , (c) armour and missiles, p. 753; (d) gold, silver, bronze; (e) lead water-pipes; (f) stamps and seals . . . . .	754
1117—1119 (ii) Products of quarries and mines, (iii) tiles, (iv) vessels of clay . . . . .	755

SECTION	PAGE
1120—1132 (II) Documents, <i>acta</i> or <i>instrumenta</i> , p. 755 ; (1) Treaties, (2) laws, (3) <i>senatus consulta</i> , municipal decrees (Pompeian inscriptions), p. 756, decrees of <i>collegia</i> , (4) decrees of magistrates (p. 757) or emperors, (5) <i>diptycha consularia</i> , (6) sacred and public documents, p. 758, <i>Monumentum Ancyranum</i> , <i>Acta Collegii Fratrum Arualium</i> , <i>Acta Sacrorum Saecularium</i> , p. 759, (7) <i>Fasti</i> etc., (8) private documents etc. (maledictions, p. 760, account-books), advertisements and other <i>graffiti</i> . . . . .	761
1133, 1134 The restoration (p. 761), and the dating of inscriptions . . . . .	762
1135 Collections of inscriptions. Forgeries, p. 762. Standard works from Marini to Mommsen . . . . .	763
IX. 2. PALAEOGRAPHY. By Sir EDWARD MAUNDE THOMPSON, G.C.B., D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., Honorary Fellow of University College, Oxford, late President of the British Academy, and late Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum.	
1136—1138 Duality of writing in ancient times. Duality of Latin writing, ordinary cursive and carefully written book-hand. Their common origin in the primitive Latin alphabet. Changes in the book-hand . . . . .	765
1139, 1140 Cursive hand, and book-hand, of the first century . . . . .	766
1140—1142 Cursive hand of the first century, p. 767; its early development, p. 769; its later progress . . . . .	770
1143—1148 The development of the literary hand, p. 770. Rare use of square capitals, p. 771, frequent use of rustic capitals, p. 772; uncial MSS, p. 773, mixed uncial and minuscule script, p. 774, half-uncial script . . . . .	775
1149—1158 National hands, p. 776, Lombardic, p. 777, Visigothic, Frankish (Merovingian), p. 778, British, p. 779, Irish (influence of the Irish script), p. 780, English . . . . .	781
1159—1161 The Carolingian reform. Changes in the Carolingian minuscule in the ninth, tenth (p. 783) and eleventh centuries . . . . .	785
1162—1164 The European hands of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. England . . . . .	786
1165, 1166 The thirteenth century. Distinctions between the national hands in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries . . . . .	787
1167, 1168 The fourteenth (p. 788) and fifteenth centuries . . . . .	789 f
IX. 3. TEXTUAL CRITICISM. By J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., F.B.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Professor of Latin in the University of Liverpool.	
1169 Definition . . . . .	791
1170—1172 Kinds of texts:—autographs, immediate copies (inscriptions), copies of copies. Deterioration of texts through copying . . . . .	792
1173, 1174 Extant MSS. Collation of MSS . . . . .	793
1175—1178 Derived MSS, p. 793. Families of MSS. <i>Stemmata codicum</i> , p. 794. 'Crossing'; conflated MSS. Limitations to genealogical method, p. 795. <i>Codices deteriores</i> . . . . .	796



SECTION	PAGE
1179, 1180 Non-extant MSS, excerpts, old printed editions . . . . .	796
1181 The transmitted text, illustrated by the text of Catullus IV and its parody . . . . .	797
1182—1187 Evidence of <i>testimonia</i> (anthologies, translations, quotations, imitations or parodies, and ancient commentaries), p. 798; <i>apparatus criticus</i> ; documental probability . . . . .	799
1188—1192 Causes of corruption, (A) external; (B) internal; involuntary corruptions (errors of the eye), p. 799; semi-voluntary and voluntary corruptions, p. 801; concurrence of corruptions . . . . .	803
1193—1195 Transcriptional probability. Errors in <i>testimonia</i> . Intrinsic probability . . . . .	803
1196 Emendation. 'Scientific interpretation'. 'Idiosyncrasy' of the author . . . . .	804
1197 Irremoveable uncertainties. 'Doublets' . . . . .	805

## CHAPTER X.

## LANGUAGE, METRE, HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP.

X. 1. THE LANGUAGES OF ITALY. By P. GILES, Litt.D.,  
Reader in Comparative Philology, Master of Emmanuel College.

1198 The spread of Latin . . . . .	806
1199—1201 Messapian. Venetic, p. 807. Ligurian . . . . .	808
1202, 1203 Gaulish, p. 808. Greek, p. 809. Greeks in Rome . . . . .	810
1204 Etruscan, p. 810. Characteristics of Etruscan . . . . .	811
1205 'Old Sabellian'. P. and Q groups . . . . .	811
1206 Umbrian, p. 813. Oscan. Campanian influence in Rome. Minor dialects . . . . .	814
Specimens of Oscan and Umbrian . . . . .	815
1207 Conspicuous differences from Latin . . . . .	816
1208 Faliscan . . . . .	817
1209 Latin. Etruscan and Sabine influence in Rome . . . . .	817
1210, 1211 Praenestine Latin, p. 818. Volscian. The Sicels . . . . .	819
1212, 1213 Roman Latin. The earliest period, p. 820. Latin accent . . . . .	821
1214 The second period . . . . .	822
1215 The Golden Age. Different types of classical Latin . . . . .	824
1216 The Silver Age. Characteristics . . . . .	825
1217 The Romance languages . . . . .	827
Specimens of Latin Inscriptions . . . . .	827

X. 2. METRE. By the late Professor A. W. VERRALL, Litt.D.,  
Fellow of Trinity College.

1218 Italian verse (Saturnian). Accent. Alliteration . . . . .	830
1219 Greek verse. Quantity . . . . .	830
1220—1223 Metre in Drama. Plautus, p. 831. Terence. Plautine Songs, p. 832. Alliteration . . . . .	833
1224—1227 Dactylic hexameter . . . . .	833
1228 Elegiac couplet . . . . .	835

SECTION	PAGE
1229 Hexameter in Satire . . . . .	836
1230—1233 Lyric Metres, p. 836. Asclepiads, p. 837. Sapphic and Alcaic Metres, p. 838 f. Lyrical Iambics etc. . . . .	839
1234, 1235 Ionic Metre, Galliambic, p. 840. Hendecasyllable, p. 841. Scazon . . . . .	842
1236 Greek Choric Metres never successfully transplanted into Latin . . . . .	842

### X. 3. HISTORY OF LATIN SCHOLARSHIP.

By SIR JOHN SANDYS, Litt.D., F.B.A.

1237 The four periods . . . . .	843
1238, 1239 (1) ROMAN PERIOD. Greek influence. Crates of Mallos . . . . .	843
1239 L. Accius. L. Aelius Stilo. Varro . . . . .	843
1240 Tyrannion. Alexander Polyhistor. L. Ateius. Nigidius Figulus. Hyginus . . . . .	844
1241, 1242 Verrius Flaccus. Remmius Palaemon. Probus. Suetonius. Gellius . . . . .	844
1243 Terentianus Maurus. Acro, Porphyrio. Nonius. Donatus. Charisius, Diomedes . . . . .	845
1244, 1245 St Jerome. Symmachus. Macrobius. Seruius . . . . .	845
1246 Martianus Capella. Priscian. Cassiodorus . . . . .	845
1247 (2) THE MIDDLE AGES. Gregory the Great. Gregory of Tours. 'Virgil' the grammarian . . . . .	846
1248, 1249 Columban and Bobbio. Gallus and St Gallen. Isidore of Seville . . . . .	846
1250 Theodore of Tarsus. Aldhelm. Bede. Boniface of Fulda . . . . .	846
1251 Paulus Diaconus. Alcuin. John the Scot. Remi . . . . .	847
1252 Alfred the Great. Hroswitha. Gerbert of Aurillac. Ælfric of Eynsham . . . . .	847
1253 John of Salisbury. Joannes de Garlandia. Vincent of Beauvais . . . . .	848
1254, 1255 The survival of the Classics. Mediaeval Latin. <i>The Battle of the Seven Arts</i> . . . . .	848
1256, 1257 (3) THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING. Petrarch. Boccaccio . . . . .	849
1258, 1259 The quest for MSS. Poggio, p. 849. Landriani. Aurispa . . . . .	850
1260 Valla. Politian . . . . .	850
1261 <i>Editiones Principes</i> . Pomponius Laetus. Andrea de' Bussi. Aldus and Paulus Manutius. The sack of Rome (1527) . . . . .	851
1262 (4) THE MODERN PERIOD. Erasmus . . . . .	851
1263 <i>The sixteenth century in Italy</i> : Vida. Victorius. Robortelli. Sigonius. Nizolius. Muretus, p. 852. The Jesuits . . . . .	853
1264—1266 France: Budæus. Robertus and Henricus Stephanus. Julius Caesar Scaliger, p. 853. Dolet. Lambinus. Cujas. Denys and Jacques Godefroy. Pithou. Joseph Justus Scaliger. Casaubon . . . . .	854
1267 The Netherlands: Lipsius . . . . .	855
1268 England: Linacre, Ascham. Scotland: Buchanan . . . . .	855
1269 Germany: Agricola (d. 1485), Reuchlin, Melanchthon, Came- rarius . . . . .	856
1270 <i>The seventeenth century in Italy</i> : Strada . . . . .	856
1271 France: Salmasius, p. 856. Du Cange. Mabillon. Huet . . . . .	857

# CONTENTS

xxxi

SECTION	PAGE
1272 The Netherlands: G. J. Vossius. D. Heinsius. Grotius. J. F. Gronovius, p. 857. N. Heinsius. Graevius. Broukhusius. Francius. Perizonius . . . . .	853
1273 England: Golding, Savile, Holland. Bond, Farnaby, Baxter. Dryden . . . . .	858
1274 Germany: Gruter. Morhof . . . . .	859
1275 <i>The eighteenth century</i> in England. Bentley. Samuel Clarke. Gibbon, p. 859. Alexander Adam. Sir William Jones . . . . .	860
1276 Netherlands: Burman I, Drakenborch, Oudendorp, Burman II . . . . .	860
1277 Italy: Facciolati, Forcellini. Lagomarsini . . . . .	861
1278 France: Montfaucon . . . . .	861
1279 <i>Editiones Bipontinae</i> . . . . .	861
1280 Germany: Fabricius. Gesner, Scheller. Ernesti, p. 861. Heyne . . . . .	862
1281 <i>The nineteenth century</i> . Switzerland: Orelli . . . . .	862
1282 Germany: Krebs. Zumpt. Nägelsbach, p. 862. Lachmann. Haupt. Ritschl. Fleckeisen. Umpfenbach. Ribbeck, p. 863. L. Müller. Bachrens. Bernhardy. Otto Jahn. Friedländer. Wölfflin. Bucheler . . . . .	864
1283 Comparative philology: Bopp. Corssen. G. Curtius. Schleicher. Brugmann . . . . .	864
1284 History: Niebuhr, p. 864. Mommsen, Hübner . . . . .	865
1285 f Georges. Traube . . . . .	866
1287 Italy: Borghesi. De Rossi, Mai. De-Vit, Corradini . . . . .	866
1288 France: Quicherat. Benoist. Riemann, p. 866. Boissier . . . . .	867
1289, 1290 Holland: Peerlkamp. Bake. Boot. Belgium: Willems . . . . .	867
1291 Denmark: Madvig. Ussing . . . . .	867
1292 England etc.: Key. Munro, p. 867. Conington. Nettleship. Henry. A. Palmer. W. Ramsay. Sellar. A. S. Wilkins . . . . .	868
1293 Historians etc.: Arnold, Long, Merivale. Parker, Burn, Middleton. Pelham. The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies . . . . .	868
I. INDEX OF PERSONS, DEITIES AND RACES . . . . .	871
II. INDEX OF PLACES, RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS . . . . .	875
III. INDEX OF SCHOLARS AND MODERN WRITERS . . . . .	878
IV. INDEX OF LATIN WORDS AND PHRASES . . . . .	880

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.

### PRIVATE ANTIQUITIES.

FIG.		PAGE
1	Gold betrothal-ring . . . . .	177
2	Marriage sacrifice . . . . .	178
3	Lying in state . . . . .	180
4	Funeral procession . . . . .	182
5	Street of the Tombs at Pompeii . . . . .	183
6	Diagram showing form of <i>toga</i> . . . . .	191
7	Man wearing <i>toga</i> . . . . .	192
8	Traveller in <i>paenula</i> reckoning with hostess in <i>stola</i> . . . . .	194
9	Woman wearing <i>palla</i> . . . . .	196
10	Coins showing various modes of hair-dressing . . . . .	198
11	Various forms of foot-covering . . . . .	199
12	Diagrams showing arrangement of a triclinium . . . . .	206
13	<i>Lectica</i> . . . . .	209
14	<i>Carpentum</i> of Agrippina the elder . . . . .	210
15	Diagram of an ancient plough . . . . .	215
16	Etruscan plough with oxen . . . . .	216
17	Hut-urn . . . . .	218
18	Cinerary urn in the form of a house . . . . .	218
19	Plan of a normal Pompeian house . . . . .	220
20	The house of the Vettii, restored . . . . .	222
21	Section through the house of the Tragic Poet, restored . . . . .	223
22	Marble table . . . . .	225
23	Two bronze <i>sellae</i> . . . . .	225

### BOOKS AND WRITING.

24	A Roman taking down a roll from its place in a library . . . . .	239
----	--	-----

### MONEY.

25	<i>Aes rude</i> . . . . .	446
26	Bronze <i>decussis</i> . . . . .	446
27	Gold <i>solidus</i> of Julian II . . . . .	452
28	Gold <i>tremissis</i> of Leo I . . . . .	452
29	Lydian electrum coin . . . . .	452
30	Coin of Croesus . . . . .	453



## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

xxxiii

FIG.		PAGE
31	Persian Daric . . . . .	453
32	Coins of Olbia, in the form of a tunny fish . . . . .	453
33 <sup>a</sup>	Roman <i>As</i> ; Circular <i>Aes grave</i> . . . . .	454
33 <sup>b</sup>	Reduced Roman <i>As</i> . . . . .	454
34	<i>Sestertius</i> of Vespasian . . . . .	455
35	Romano-Campanian Silver Coin . . . . .	455
36	Early <i>denarius</i> . . . . .	455
37	<i>Denarius</i> of the <i>Gens Marcia</i> . . . . .	456
38	Coin of Aemilius Scaurus . . . . .	456
39	<i>Denarius</i> of Augustus . . . . .	457
40	<i>Denarius</i> of Iulius Caesar . . . . .	457

## WAR.

41	Roman legionary . . . . .	470
42	Plan of the Battle of Bibracte . . . . .	473
43	Plan of the Battle of Cannae . . . . .	474
44	Section of the walls of Pompeii . . . . .	478
45	<i>Catapulta</i> , according to Vitruvius . . . . .	481
46	Roman standard-bearer . . . . .	486
47	Roman centurion . . . . .	488

## THE THEATRE.

43	Ancient plan of the Theatre of Pompey, Rome . . . . .	514
49	View of the Large Theatre, Pompeii . . . . .	516
50	Plan of the Large Theatre, Pompeii . . . . .	517

## ARCHITECTURE.

51	Plan of Tuscan Temple, according to Vitruvius . . . . .	525
52	Tuscan column, found at Pompeii . . . . .	525
53	Plan of the Temple of Venus and Roma . . . . .	528
54	Section of the Temple of Venus and Roma . . . . .	529
55	Roman-Doric order, Theatre of Marcellus . . . . .	530
56	Roman-Ionic capital . . . . .	531
57	Roman-Ionic order, Temple of 'Fortuna Virilis' . . . . .	532
58	Roman-Corinthian order, Temple of Castor and Pollux . . . . .	533
59	Composite capital, Arch of Titus . . . . .	534
60	Corinthian capital, Temple of Concord . . . . .	535
61	'Pont du Gard' near Nîmes . . . . .	536
62	Concrete wall faced with triangular bricks . . . . .	538
63	<i>Opus incertum</i> and <i>opus reticulatum</i> . . . . .	539
64	Plan of the Pantheon and part of the 'Thermae' of Agrippa . . . . .	541
65	Interior of the Pantheon . . . . .	542
66	The 'Maison Carrée' at Nîmes . . . . .	543
67	Plan of the 'Maison Carrée,' Nîmes . . . . .	544
68	Interior of the 'Thermae' of Caracalla . . . . .	546
69	Plan of the 'Thermae' of Caracalla . . . . .	547
70	Section of the Colosseum . . . . .	548

## SCULPTURE.

FIG.		PAGE
71	Bronze 'Camillus' . . . . .	551
72	Bust of 'Sulla' . . . . .	553
73	Part of the statue of Augustus from Prima Porta . . . . .	554
74	Bust of 'Brutus' in the Museo Capitolino . . . . .	555
75	Bust of Vespasian in the Museo Capitolino . . . . .	556
76	Bust of Hadrian in the Museo Capitolino . . . . .	557
77	Bust of Commodus in the Palazzo de' Conservatori . . . . .	558
78	Philippus Arabs, of the Vatican . . . . .	559
79	Private portrait-bust (age of Gallienus) . . . . .	559
80	Consul throwing the <i>mappa</i> . . . . .	560
81	Ara Pacis Augustae, from the east half of the south side . . . . .	562
82	Relief from the Arch of Titus . . . . .	564
83	Flavian Medallion from the Arch of Constantine . . . . .	565
84	Relief from Trajan's forum . . . . .	566
85	Relief from the Arch of Trajan . . . . .	568
86	Panel from an Arch of Marcus Aurelius . . . . .	569
87	Arch of Septimius Seuerus . . . . .	571
88	Perseus and Andromeda . . . . .	572
89	Roman Sarcophagus, Battle of Romans and barbarians . . . . .	574
90	Christian Sarcophagus, 'Concordantia ueteris et noui Testamenti' . . . . .	576

## ENGRAVED GEMS.

91	Impression from an early Babylonian cylinder . . . . .	581
92	Example of a lenticular gem of heraldic type, in rock crystal . . . . .	582
93	Greek scarab of the sixth century B.C. of the finest archaic style . . . . .	582
94	Greek scarab-gem of the best period of Art . . . . .	582
95	Roman gem; Victory . . . . .	584
96	Roman gem; Jupiter . . . . .	584
97	Profile portrait of Nero and Poppaea . . . . .	585
98	Profile portrait of the Empress Domitia . . . . .	585
99	Laureated portrait of Caracalla . . . . .	585
100	The Abraxas deity . . . . .	586
101	Head of Augustus, in sardonix . . . . .	587
102	Portrait of youth, in sardonix . . . . .	588

## PAINTING AND MOSAIC.

103	Landscape from the 'Odyssey' . . . . .	595
104	Doves perched on the rim of a bowl . . . . .	599

## EPIGRAPHY.

105	Greek alphabet on the Formello vase . . . . .	729
106	Inscription on the <i>Fibula Praenestina</i> . . . . .	731
107	Inscription on the archaic cippus in the Forum . . . . .	732
108	The 'Duenos' inscription . . . . .	733
109	Dedicatory inscription from Tusculum . . . . .	734
110	Tomb of Scipio Barbatus, consul 298, censor 290 B.C. . . . .	734
111	Epitaph of Scipio Barbatus . . . . .	735

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

XXXV

FIG.		PAGE
112	Epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio, consul 259 B.C. . . . .	735
113	Epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio, probably a son of Hispallus . . . . .	736
114	Epitaph of P. Cornelius P. f. Scipio, flamen Dialis . . . . .	736
115	Epitaph of Caecilia Metella on the Via Appia, Rome . . . . .	737
116	Inscription from an obelisk in the Circus Maximus, now in the Piazza del Popolo, Rome . . . . .	737
117	Inscription from a Pompeian pedestal, in the Museum of Naples . . . . .	738
118	Pompeian graffiti, including two quotations from the poets . . . . .	738
119	Inscription on a pedestal at Thamugadi (Timgad), N. Africa . . . . .	739
120	Inscription from the 'written rock' on the river Gelt . . . . .	745
121	Inscription from the <i>Columna Rostrata</i> , in honour of C. Duilius, consul 260 B.C. . . . .	749
122	<i>Miliarium</i> of P. Popilius Laenas, consul 132 B.C. . . . .	751
123	Decree of L. Aemilius Paulus, proconsul 189 B.C. . . . .	757
124	Extract from the Speech of Claudius at Lyons, 48 A.D. . . . .	758
125	Part of the heading and of two items of the <i>Monumentum Ancyranum</i> , 14 A.D. . . . .	759
126	Extract from the <i>Acta Triumphorum</i> of 12 B.C. . . . .	760

## PALAEOGRAPHY.

127	Poem on the Battle of Actium, before A.D. 79 . . . . .	767
128	Pompeian tablet, A.D. 59 . . . . .	768
129	Fragment of Speeches, A.D. 41—54. . . . .	768
130	Official Letter, cent. iv . . . . .	769
131	Epitome of Livy, cent. iii . . . . .	771
132	The Medicean Virgil, before A.D. 494 . . . . .	772
133	Vienna MS of Livy, cent. v. . . . .	773
134	Florentine Pandects, cent. vi . . . . .	775
135	Biblical Commentary, Monte Cassino, before A.D. 569 . . . . .	776
136	Laurentian MS of Caesar, cent. xi . . . . .	777
137	Leiden MS of Pliny, cent. ix . . . . .	782
138	Harleian MS of Cicero, <i>De Oratore</i> , about middle of cent. ix . . . . .	784
139	British Museum MS of Suetonius, from St Albans, end of cent. xii . . . . .	787
140	British Museum MS of Horace, written at Cremona, 1391 . . . . .	789
141	British Museum MS of Sallust, written at Florence, 1466 . . . . .	790

## MAPS.

Ancient Rome . . . . .	To face p. 35
The Roman Forum . . . . .	" " 46



# I. GEOGRAPHY AND ETHNOLOGY OF ITALY.

## I. 1. GEOGRAPHY.

1. THE name *Italia* was originally confined to the extreme south of the south-west portion of the Apennine peninsula. Such is the sense given to the name by the Greek historian, Italy. Antiochus of Syracuse (*fl.* 423 B.C.), as quoted by Strabo (p. 254). The region subsequently included in the name extended only as far as Metapontum on the bay of Tarentum and Poseidōnia on the Western Sea. The Iapygian peninsula, east of the bay of Tarentum, was distinguished from Italy by Thucydides (vii 33); and the pine-trees of the Bruttian peninsula were described by Theophrastus as the pine-trees of *Italia*, as contrasted with those of Latium (*H. P.* v 8). The region north of Poseidonia was once known as *Opicia* or *Tyrrhenia*. In its narrowest sense, *Italia*, 'the land of oxen', had an earlier alternative designation in *Oenotria*, 'the land of wine'. To the Greeks the whole peninsula was vaguely known as the 'western land', *Hesperia* (*Aen.* i 534). The name *Ausōnia*, originally applied to the territory of the *Ausōnes* or *Aurunci* S.E. of Latium, was extended to the whole peninsula, and, similarly, the 'Saturnian land', confined by Ennius to Latium, is synonymous in Virgil with the whole of Italy (*Georg.* ii 173).

Under the Roman Republic, *Gallia Cisalpina* was technically outside the limits of Italy, which then extended, on the north-west, as far as the Auser, near Pisa, and, on the north-east, to the Rubicon; but, in popular language and in poetry, in Cicero and Caesar, and also in Virgil, *Italia* was applied to the whole peninsula, although it was not until shortly after the death of Caesar and Cicero that *Gallia Cisalpina* was merged in Italy.

The Italian peninsula is formed by the mountain system of the Apennines which is deflected in a south-east direction from the western portion of the Alps. But, while the loftiest summits of the Alps rise, at Mont Blanc and Monte Rosa, to more than 15,000 feet above the level of the sea, the highest part of the Apennines, the *Gran Sasso d' Italia*, is less than 10,000 feet in height, and hardly reaches the line of perpetual snow.



The chain of the Apennines leaves a vast plain to the east, in the valley of the Pădus; smaller plains, to the west, in the lands of the *Latini* and *Campani*; and, finally, a long stretch of fairly level ground, to the east, in Apulia. Near the isolated cone of Mons Vultur, at the meeting-point of Apulia, Samnium, and Lucania, the mountain-chain parts in two directions, that on the east declining into the low hills of the ancient Calabria, while, in the west, it maintains a far loftier elevation, rising as high as 7000 feet before it descends to the Sicilian strait.

The mountains of the peninsula enclose many valleys and table-lands connected with each other by easy passes. The Adriatic coast, owing to its lack of harbours, was unattractive to the Greek colonist. Ancōna, which derived its Greek name from the 'elbow' of land which protected its port, was the only Greek colony on that coast, and it was founded at no earlier date than 380 B.C. But, as soon as the southern promontory of that coast was turned, there were many bays and harbours on the southern and the western shores, beginning with the bay of Tarentum and ending with the bay of Cumae, which at an early date were lined with Greek colonies and thus received the name of *Magna Graecia*.

2. While the Italian peninsula resembles that of Greece in its temperate climate, and in its possession of valleys and plains interspersed among mountains of moderate elevation, there are not a few important points of contrast. The shores of Greece are not only penetrated by many inlets, but are also washed by seas studded with innumerable islands, which invited even the most timorous seamen to maritime and commercial enterprise. On the other hand, the coasts of Italy and Sicily have but a few islands, and those scattered in separate groups, at a considerable distance from one another, such as the Lipari and the Pontian islands, and those near the isle of Ilva. As compared with Greece, Italy, 'the land of cattle', with its grassy slopes and its alluvial plains, was better adapted for agriculture and for pasture than for maritime adventure.

While the outlets of Greece looked towards the east, those of Italy looked to the west. The eastern coast of the Adriatic was of little consequence to Greece, and its western coast was of as little consequence to Italy, so that the two peninsulas stood back to back, and developed independently in two opposite directions, Greece towards the east and Italy towards the west. It was not until after the completion of five centuries from the foundation of Rome, that a Greek freedman of Tarentum became the earliest of Roman poets (240 B.C.), and that Rome entered into diplomatic relations with Greece (228).

3. Italy, in the widest sense of the term, consists of three regions, the Northern, the Central, and the Southern. **Northern Italy** was divided into three districts, known as *Ligūria*, *Gallia Cisalpina*, and *Vēnētia*. **Liguria** extended inland from the coast of the Maritime Alps and the north-western Apennines to the river

Italy  
and Greece.

Northern  
Italy.

Padus and the land of the Taurini. The inhabitants were regarded by the Romans as a rude race combining craft and deceit with hardihood and courage (Cic. *Agr.* ii 95, *Sest.* 69; and Virg. *Georg.* ii 168, with Servius on *Aen.* xi 700). **Venetia** lay to the north-east of the lower course of the Padus, reaching across the Athësis to the springs of the Timäuus and the peninsula of Histria. Near the south of that peninsula lay the city of Pöla, with its celebrated amphitheatre, its temples, and its *Porta Aurea*. Towards the north was Tergeste (*Trieste*), and across the gulf of that town stood the far more famous Aquileia, described by Ausonius as the ninth city of the Empire. Pätäuium, the birth-place of Livy, was the capital of the land of the *Vēnēti*, when the city of Venice was still unborn.

Between *Venetia* and *Liguria*, and bounded by the Alps and Apennines, lay **Gallia Cisalpina**, a vast level expanse 200 miles in length by 60 to 100 in breadth, parted into the two regions of *Gallia Transpadana* and *Cispadana* by the great river Padus, Virgil's 'fluuiorum rex Eridanus' (*Georg.* i 481).

The passes leading into Gaul crossed the Alps at the following points. (1) The *Col di Tenda* between the Maritime and Ligurian Alps; (2) the *Col d' Argentière*, south of the Cottian Alps; (3) *Mont Genève*, north of those Alps; (4) *Mont Cenis*, south of the Graian Alps; (5) *Little St Bernard*, north of them; and (6) *Great St Bernard*, west of the Pennine range. The Raetian passes included those now known as (1) the Simplon, (2) the S. Bernardino, (3) the Splügen, (4) the Septimer, (5) the Julier, (6) the Reschen-Scheideck, and (7) the Brenner. There were also the less celebrated passes into Illyria<sup>1</sup>.

Alpine  
passes.

At the foot of the Alps lay the great lakes of Verbannus (*Lago Maggiore*), Lārius (*Lago di Como*) and Bēnācus (*Lago di Garda*). The first and largest of these is never named by Virgil, who alludes to the great lake of Como, and the tempestuous *Lago di Garda*, in the lines in which he claims the Northern lakes, and the Eastern and Western seas, as part of the glories of Italy (*Georg.* ii 158 f). Cōmum, on the Larian lake, has been immortalised by the younger Pliny, and Sirmio, on the *Lago di Garda*, by Catullus. The *Lago di Lugano*, next in size to the three already mentioned, had in classic days no *vates sacer*, and, indeed, is never named by any ancient author. The Verbannus is united to the Padus by the river Ticinus, celebrated by

Lakes  
and rivers.

<sup>1</sup> For full details, see H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, i (1883) 155—167. On the controversy as to Hannibal's passage of the Alps, see (1) H. L. Wickham and J. A. Cramer's *Dissertation*, ed. 2, 1828; W. J. Law, *The Alps of Hannibal*, 1866; Mommsen, *H. R.* Book III, chap. iv; K. Lehmann, *Die Angriffe der drei Barkiden auf Italien* (1905) (*Little St Bernard*); (2) Robert Ellis, *Hannibal's Passage*, 1853, and *Ancient Routes*, 1867; T. G. Bonney, in Ball's *Alpine Guide*, § 7, route C; Nissen, *l. c.*; and Oslander, *Der Hannibalweg*, 1900 (*Mont Cenis*); (3) Fuchs, *Hannibals Alpenübergang*, 1897 (*Mont Genève*); and, in general, Arnold's *Second Punic War*, ed. 1886, pp. 362—373.

poets for its placid and pellucid waters (Sil. Ital. iv 83 f), and by historians as the scene of the battle in which the Romans were defeated by Hannibal, who was also victorious on the Trèbia, a southern affluent falling into the Padus west of Placentia. The Larian lake is connected with the Padus by the river Addua, and Benacus by the Mincius, which falls into the Padus near Mantua (*Georg.* iii 14 f). From the Raetian Alps the Athësis descends a deep gorge, east of the *Lago di Garda*, till it reaches the open country at Verona, the birth-place of Catullus. On a stream that falls into the Padus north of Placentia, lay Mediolanum, the central citadel of the Gallic tribe of Insubres. It was to keep the Gauls in check that Placentia and Cremona were founded on the eve of the Second Punic War, and it was from Placentia that the *Via Aemilia* ran to the south-east, passing Parma and Regium Lepidum and Mùtina and Bononia, and subsequently crossing the Rubicon, and reaching the sea at Ariminum, the first city in Umbria. On the coast north of Ariminum was the great naval station of Ravenna, first chosen for that purpose by Pompey, and it was from Ravenna that Caesar set forth on the eventful march that brought him to the Rubicon, Lucan's 'puniceus Rubicon', which flows through the valleys, 'et Gallica certus | limes ab Ausoniis disternit arua colonis' (i 213 f). It also marks the transition from Northern to **Central Italy**.

4. We follow Caesar to Ariminum, where we reach the *Via Flaminia*, which skirts the coast to Pisaurum and Fanum Fortunae, Umbria, where it goes up the Metaurus, memorable for the defeat of Hasdrubal, crosses the Apennines and the Nar, and passes Soracte as it draws near to Rome. On the coast below Fanum Fortunae we come to Sena Gallica (*Senigallia*), which recalls the name of the *Galli Sënònes*, whose former territory beside the Adriatic was added by Augustus to the region of **Umbria**, which at first was limited to an inland region between the Apennines, the Tiber and the Nar. Here, in the heart of the Apennines, lay Ìgùvium (*Gubbio*), where the celebrated *Tabulae Eugubinae*, with inscriptions in the ancient Umbrian and Latin alphabets, are still preserved. The Tiber, flowing past Tifernum Tiberinum (*Borgo San Sepolcro*), near the site of the younger Pliny's Tuscan villa, formed the boundary between Umbria and Etruria. Near the southern extremity of Umbria it was joined by the Nar, 'sulphurea Nar albus aqua', coming down from Interamna, where the waters of the *lacus Velinus*, which once devastated the *rosca rura Velini*, are discharged by a channel cut in 271 B.C. by Manius Curius Dentatus, the conqueror of the Sabines, thus forming the famous falls of Terni, which plunge in three successive cascades down a precipice of 650 feet. For the sublime grandeur of these falls the ancients have not a word to say; they only notice the rainbow in the spray above the ravine (Plin. ii 153). Further to the north, in the centre of the uplands south of the Apennines, lay the fertile plain, where the white oxen of Mevania might be seen browsing beside the clear waters of the Clitumnus.

5. From Umbria we cross the Tiber into **Etruria**, a hilly region of vast extent, bounded on the north by the Apennines, and on the west by the marshes of the *Maremma*. The two chief rivers were the Arnus, flowing past Arrêtium and Florentia, below the rocky perch of Faesûlæ, to the port of Pisae; and the Clanis, slowly moving through the level valley to the little lakes of Clusium, till it mingles its waters with the Tiber. Far above Clusium and the Clanis, 'Cortona lifts to heaven her diadem of towers', while to the west the 'lordly Volaterræ' looks down on the Tuscan Sea. Further south, from the *Via Aurelia*, which ran along the coast, the isle of Ilva might be seen facing the 'sea-girt' promontory of Populonia, while still further southward, near Cösa, the *Portus Herculis* is formed by another promontory, the *Mons Argentarius*. In the volcanic region of Southern Etruria lie the lakes that fill the craters of several extinct volcanoes. The largest of these is 'the great Volsinian mere'. Further south, from the road through the Ciminian forest, high above a lake of the same name, we catch our first glimpse of Rome; and Rome itself, we may remember, was once supplied with water from the lake still further south, the *Lacus Săbătinus*. To the north of all these lakes, in the triangle formed by Cortona, Clusium, and Perusia, lies the *lacus Trăšimēnus*, on whose northern shore the Romans were defeated by Hannibal. Near the coast are the sites of Tarquinii and of Caere, and, inland, those of Falerii and of Veii, the latter only twelve miles from Rome.

6. To the south-east of Umbria, and parted from Etruria by the river Tiber, lay the land of the **Sabini**, a land of lofty mountains. To the extreme north, the meeting-point with Umbria and Picenum is marked by the *Montagna della Sibilla*, which corresponds to the 'Tetrica rupes' and the 'mons Seuerus' of Virgil (*Aen.* vii 713). In the centre rises *Monte Terminello* (7250 feet), part of the ancient 'Montes Gurgûres'. Further to the east runs the range of 'Mons Fiscellus', the *Gran Sasso d' Italia*, where the Apennines rise to 9815 feet, above the ancient site of Amiternum, the birth-place of Sallust. To the south the Mons Lucrētīlis (*Monte Gennaro*), conspicuous in all views to the north-east of Rome, attains an altitude of 4160 feet, while east of Lucretilis lies the little valley of the Digentia, which flows past the Sabine farm of Horace. Though the Nar rises to the north of this region, the only strictly Sabine stream is the Avens, which swells the waters of the *lacus Velinus*, far the largest of the many tarns and meres, which stud the rugged and lofty region round Reate, the birth-place of Varro. We are now on the *Via Salaria* which leads from Rome to Picenum.

7. **Picēnum**, the land of the Picentes, lies between the Adriatic and the Umbrians and the Sabines. In the north, the Greek colony of Ancōna juts out into the sea. The ancient capital was Ascŭlum Picenum (*Ascoli*, on the *Via Salaria*), the capture of which in 268 B.C. compelled the Picentes to submit to Rome.



8. South of the Picentes were the **Vestini** and **Marrucini**, separated from one another by the river Aternus, while the lofty valleys, which lay inland from these tribes, were held by the **Paeligni** and the **Marsi**. The climate of these valleys in the heart of the Apennines was one of the coldest in Italy. 'Paeligna frigora' is a proverbial phrase in Horace (*Carm.* iii 19, 8), and Ovid says of his native place in this region:—'Sulmo mihi patria est, gelidis uberrimus undis' (*Tristia*, iv 10, 3). Coming from the Adriatic, the *Via Valeria* passed through Corfinium, the capital of the Paeligni, to the land of the hardy Marsi, who lived round the *lacus Fucinus*, the central point of Italy, itself 2176 feet above the sea, with many lofty mountains looking down upon it. On the south-west shore lay the 'lacus Angitiaë', the sacred grove of a Marsic goddess. The simples gathered on the Marsic mountains were of no avail, we may remember, to stay the death of one of Virgil's heroes, the soldier-priest 'fortissimus Umbro':—

'Te nemus Angitiaë, uitrea te Fucinus unda,  
Te liquidi fleuere lacus' (*Aen.* vii 759 f).

The lake had no natural outlet and was liable to sudden rises which flooded the lands of the Marsi. A scheme for tapping the water by means of a tunnel more than a mile long was carried out by the Emperor Claudius (Pliny, xxxvi 124; Tac. *Ann.* xii 56 f). In 1862 this memorable work was restored and greatly extended by the enterprise of Prince Torlonia, which has converted the lake into a fertile farm of 36,000 acres.

9. **Lātium** was originally simply the land of the Lātini, bounded on the north by the Tiber, and by the Apennines and the Tyrrhenian Sea, while to the south-east it extended no further than the Circaean promontory. On the coast between Antium and Ostia was Lāuīnium, traditionally founded by Aeneas, and, further inland, Lānūuium with its temple of Juno Sospita. In the middle of the plain, five miles from the foot of the Apennines, rose the volcanic group of the Alban hills with the Alban lake resting in its green crater, and the Alban mount crowned with the central sanctuary of the Latian Jove looking down on Alba Longa. On a wooded ridge to the north of the Alban hills lay Tusculum, while to the south was the lake of Nemi (the *lacus Nemoensis*) and the grove of Diana.

Some fourteen miles above the mouth of the Tiber lay, on the left bank of the river, the hills of moderate elevation which formed the site of Rome. Owing to the slight fall of the stream, the low-lying lands between the hills were liable to frequent floods, and the site in general was less healthy and less fertile than that of most of the old Latin towns; but its vicinity to the river rendered it a suitable place for an emporium, while, in the strength of its position, it was well fitted to be the frontier-fortress of Latium. (The *Topography of Rome* is reserved for the third part of the present Chapter.)



Latium, in its widest sense, extended as far as the Mons Massicus on the Campanian border, and thus included the lands of the Hernici, the Volsci and the Aurunci. It was separated from Etruria by its principal river, the Tiber, flowing from the north to Ostia. The Anio, flowing from the north-east and supplying, in the early part of its course, two of the aqueducts of Rome, emerged from the mountains at Tibur and plunged down the rocks in several fine cascades. Soon afterwards it received the sulphurous stream of the Albula, and, winding its way through the plain, washed the lower slopes of the Mons Sacer before uniting its waters to those of the Tiber. A few miles above the confluence of the Anio, the Tiber was joined on the west by the Crēmēra, and on the east by the Allia, which on the same fatal day of the year (July 16) were respectively the scenes of the almost complete extinction of the Fabian gens (477), and of the defeat of the Romans by the Gauls (390).

The lands of the Hernici and Volsci were divided by the Trērus, a tributary stream which flows to the south-east towards the 'rura quae Liris quieta mordet aqua, taciturnus amnis'. The Liris reaches the sea at Minturnae, where Marius lay concealed amid the marshes in 88 B.C., while to the east, some sixty years before, the town of Suessa Aurunca had given birth to Lucilius.

The *Via Latina*, after passing through the Alban hills, south of Tusculum, was joined by an ancient road, which had meanwhile passed through Gabii to Praeneste; it then followed the valley of the Trerus, and after touching Aquinum and Cāsinum (at the foot of *Monte Cassino*) ended in Campania at Cāsilinum. There it was joined by the *Via Appia*, which had in the meantime taken a straighter course through Aricia and had struck across the Pomptine marshes to Tarrācina, described by Horace, under its earlier name, as 'impositum saxis late candentibus Anxur' (*Sat.* i 5, 26). Passing inland to Fundi and rejoining the sea at Formiae, it then went through Minturnae to Sinuessa, and, crossing the Massic mount, joined the *Via Latina* at Casilinum. It soon entered Capua, and afterwards went on to Beneventum, Tarentum, and Brundisium.

10. **Campania** was limited at first to the land of the *Campani*, which is not synonymous with *campestres*, or 'the dwellers in the plain', but is the Latin equivalent of *Καππανοί*, the Campania. inhabitants of Capua, from which the *Via Campana* ran to Pūtēōli on the bay of Naples. It subsequently included the hills of the Samnian and Lucanian borders, with the mountainous coast from Cumae to Salernum, as well as the level land bounded to the south-east by the Silārus. Its most important river was the Volturnus. From Sinuessa, beyond the Mons Massicus, the *Via Domitia* crossed the mouth of the Volturnus, and skirted the sea-coast until it reached the old Greek colony of Cumae, which gave its name to the *Sinus Cumanus*, better known as the bay of Naples. To the north-west of that bay are the volcanic islands of Aenāria and Prōchŷta, and the promontory of Mīsēnum. Descending from this lofty foreland, we

fringe the shore of the bay of Baiæ, and soon reach the two small lakes, the shallow lagoon of the Lucine, and the ancient crater now filled with the waters of the Avernus (*Georg.* ii 161 f). We pass the Greek settlements of Dicæarchia (*Plin.* iv) and Neapolis, and Herculaneum and Pompeii, lying exposed to all the perils of Vesuvius, and after crossing the safer strand of Stabiae, find ourselves near the rocky foreland of Surrentum with the famous view of Capreae from the promontory of Minerva. Rounding this, we pass the islands of the Sirens and finally reach the glorious bay of Salerno.

11. Between Campania and the Adriatic lies the mountain-region of Samnium, traversed by the *Via Appia*, which passed through the *Fauces Caudinae* shortly before reaching the ancient 'apple-town' of Μᾶλοφύρτα, or *Maleuentum*, a name of evil omen, changed by the Romans into Beneuentum (*Plin.* iii 105). The country was also traversed by another route, branching off from Venafrum to Aesernia on the upper Volturnus, by which the Roman armies were wont to reach the heart of Samnium at Bouianum, near the source of the river Tifernus, and at the foot of the mountain of the same name. In the mountains separating Samnium from Campania, the ridge of Mons Tifata, commanding Capua and the Volturnus, was long held by Hannibal in the Second Punic War.

12. Southern Italy included Apulia and Calabria to the east, and Lucania and the land of the Bruttii to the west. Apulia extended to the south east, from the territory of the Fruntani on the Adriatic, and from the inland border of Samnium to the immediate neighbourhood of Tarentum. In its northern portion, the 'spur of Italy', the wind swept promontory of Mons Garganus, with its dense forests of oak-trees, rises above the low hills clad with box and with aromatic herbs frequented by the 'Matin bee', while on the strand below was once washed ashore the lifeless form of Archytas of Tarentum (*Hor. Carm.* i 28, 3; iv 2, 27). The largest of the Apulian rivers is the impetuous Aufidus, which flows to the south of Asculum, where the Romans were defeated by Pyrrhus, and, not far from the Adriatic, passes the fatal field of Cannæ. The river rises in Mons Vultur, which, from a height of 4363 feet above the level of the sea, looks down on Venusia, the birth-place of Horace, amid the mountains of Apulia immediately to the north of the Lucanian frontier. Born on the confines of both regions, the poet aptly describes himself as 'Lucanus an Apulus anceps; | nam Venusinus arat finem sub utrumque colonus' (*Serm.* ii 1, 35). The lands, in fact, of three peoples meet near this point, and the Venusian region, which is really in Apulia, is regarded by Strabo as on the borders of Lucania and Samnium, and even as belonging to Samnium and not to Apulia (pp. 254, 283). It is immediately within the Apulian border that we find the dwelling-places of the poet's neighbours in his early boyhood:—'quæcumque colas nidum Acheruntiae, | saltusque

Bantinos, et aruum | pingue tenent humilis Forenti'. Six miles south of Venusia, a fountain was still shown in the 12th century as the *fons Bandusinus*, and, although the structure of the fountain has been destroyed, its waters are still abundant. The site of this famous fountain is, however, sometimes placed, not in the land of the poet's birth, but in the immediate neighbourhood of the poet's Sabine farm, beside the waters of the Digentia.

13. The 'heel-piece of Italy', known to the Romans as **Calabria**, was inhabited by the Calabri on the Adriatic coast, and by the Sallentini on the bay of Tarentum. It was known to **Calabria**, the Greeks as Messapia or Iapygia. On the Adriatic stands Brundisium, the goal of the Appian way and the port of departure for Greece. South of Brundisium is the site of the little inland town of Rudiae, the birth-place of Ennius, who is described by Ovid as 'Calabris in montibus ortus' (*A. A.* iii 409). West of Brundisium the great city of Tarentum stood at the head of the bay to which it gave its name. The city was built on a rocky promontory that parts the bay from the spacious harbour. Founded by Lacedaemonians in 708 B.C., it was not until 272 that it became subject to Rome. It was famous for the fertility of its surroundings. Its honey (so Horace declares) rivalled that of Hymettus; its olives, those of Venafrum (*Carm.* ii 6, 12—16). Beneath the shade of the pine-woods sung by Propertius, the stream of the Galēsus flowed through the vale of Aulon, which was famed for its vines and for its wool. The wool, which was dyed with the rich purple of the local *murex*, is described by Horace as the 'lana Tarentino uiolas imitata ueneno' (*Ep.* ii 1 207). The scallops held in high repute by Roman epicures are still strewn on the shores of the bay and harbour, thus verifying the poet's line:—'pectinibus patulis iactat se molle Tarentum' (*Serm.* ii 4, 34).

14. **Lucania**, parted from Calabria by the river Brădănuș and from Campania by the Silărus, is bounded to the south by the streams of the Laūs and the Crăthis. Near its northern **Lucania**, frontier, the farthest city to the west was the Greek settlement founded by Sŷbaris under the name of Poseidōnia, and converted into a Roman colony under the name of Paestum. Virgil (*Georg.* iv 119) tells of its roses that flowered twice in each year, and, in May and November, those roses still bloom<sup>1</sup> amid the ruins of the three great Doric temples, which are never named by any ancient author. South of Paestum lay Vēlia, the Greek colony of Elēa, the home of the Eleatic school of philosophy, beginning with Xenophanes, who wrote a long poem on the foundation of the city, in which his successors Parmenides and Zeno were born. To the south-east was the bold foreland of Palinurus (*Aen.* vi 381). To the extreme east of Lucania, on the bay of Tarentum, lay the Achæan colony of Metapontum, with its Doric temple like those of Paestum, and with its memories of the declining years of Pythagoras (*Cic. De Finibus*, v 4).

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Eustace's *Classical Tour*, ii 302, ed. 1841; E. H. Bunbury in Smith's *Dict. of Geogr.*; and § 94 infra.

The neighbouring stream of the Bradanus flows down from Bantia, within the Apulian frontier, some eight miles from which was discovered the bronze tablet of the *lex Bantina*, the most important relic of the Oscan tongue. The mountain-glades of Bantia have been already mentioned. The whole of the Lucanian land abounded in mountain-pastures, to which the flocks were driven when the drought of summer destroyed the herbage of Calabria (*Epod.* i 27). With the exception of a broad strip of plain on the coast between Metapontum and Heraclea, almost the whole of Lucania is filled with the rugged ranges of the Apennines, the highest parts being near the border of Samnium to the north and that of the land of the Bruttii to the south.

15. The land of the Bruttii has no distinctive Latin name beyond that of its inhabitants. Modern writers erroneously speak of *Bruttium*, and the Italians have even transferred to this region the name of *Calabria* which, in ancient times, belonged to the 'heel' and not to the 'toe' of Italy. It was once known as *Oenotria*, 'the land of wine'; and, as we have already seen, it was the earliest part of the peninsula to bear the name of *Italia*, 'the land of cattle'. Among the mountains to the south, extended the vast forests of Sila, the scene of more than one battle of the bulls in Virgil (*Georg.* iii 219; *Aen.* xii 715). Like Italy as a whole, this small portion of the peninsula has been aptly compared to a boot, of which the heel is formed by the Lacinian promontory near Croton; the toe, by the promontory of Leucopetra, and the hollow of the sole, by the bay of Squillace, Virgil's 'nauifragum Scylaceum' (*Aen.* iii 553). Near this bay the ground lies low between the western and the eastern seas. To the north-east, on the river Crāthis, lay the luxurious city of Sýbāris, after the destruction of which, by the people of Crōtōn, the colony of Thurii was founded further inland by the Athenians in 443. The Achaean colony of Croton came for a time (*c.* 540—530) under the influence of Pythagoras; and one of his pupils, the athlete Milo, was in command of the forces which overthrew the Sybarites (*c.* 510). Passing two promontories further to the south, we reach a great bend in the shore, where we recall the fact that, in the days when the Roman age was being merged in the Middle Ages, it was on the bay of Squillace that a monastery devoted to classical and to sacred learning was founded by Cassiodorus. Far to the south is the foreland of Zephyrium, the site of a Greek settlement which afterwards removed further north, where, in memory of its earliest and its latest home, it took the double name of Locri Epizephyrii.

The *Via Popilia*, which, in 132 B.C., was extended through the whole of Southern Italy, from Capua to the Sicilian strait, ended at Rhegium, the old Chalcidic colony, which derived its name from the fact that it was at this point that Italy and Sicily were rent asunder<sup>1</sup>. But the most

<sup>1</sup> Aesch. ap. Strabo, ἀφ' οὗ δὴ 'Ρῆγιον κικλήσκεται, and *Aen.* iii 414-9. The Latin form of the name is *Regium*.



frequent place for crossing over into Sicily was, in ancient (as in modern) times, a point nine miles north, which was marked by a column and known by the name of *Columna Rhegina*.

16. The triangular shape of the island of **Sicily** was early recognised, and the proportions (and, in general, even the dimensions) were correctly estimated by Poseidōnius (ap. Strabo, 266). Sicily.

The Latin poets borrowed from the Greek the name of *Trinacria*, derived from the three promontories at its three angles,—*Pelōrum* to the North, *Pachynum* to the South, and *Lilybaeum* to the West. This last is 80 miles distant from the nearest point of Africa, while the *Frētum Sicūlum*, separating Sicily from Italy, is less than two miles at its narrowest part.

Sicily is, in general, a table-land of the mean elevation of 2300—2800 feet, and is higher near the coast than in the interior. Of its non-volcanic mountains the loftiest are in the range running westward from the straits as a continuation of the Apennines, the mountains on both sides being composed of crystalline rocks of the primary formations. In the centre of this range we find summits as high as 6265 and 6480 feet, the latter being exceeded by Mount Aetna alone. At its western extremity is the isolated pyramid of Mount Eryx, with a small town on the top (2465 ft), the last stronghold of the Phoenicians in Sicily. There are other ranges running from the northern to the southern coasts, while on the east we have Mons Neptunus extending for 40 miles, as far as Taurōmēnium. It is there merged in the volcanic region that culminates in Mount Aetna (10,870 ft), which is loftier than any mountain in the Italian peninsula, and is the largest volcano in Europe. Its eruptions are described in Pindar (*Pyth.* i 35 f), Aeschylus (*P. V.* 365–9), and Virgil (*Aen.* iii 571 f), and are discussed by the unknown author of the hexameter poem known as the *Aetna*. Of the three zones of vegetation on the slopes of this mountain, the lowest produces oranges and lemons, while the vine predominates in its upper portion; the next is clothed with oaks and chestnuts, above which are copper-beeches and birches and large forests of Laricio pines; while the highest, from 6900 feet to the summit, only produces the most stunted vegetation. The largest part of the island is, however, singularly fertile, and well adapted for the growth of corn. The elder Cato called it the *cella penaria* of the Roman republic and the *nutrix* of the Roman people, while Cicero described it as the ‘island of Ceres’ (*Verr.* ii ii 5, iii 226, v 99). Mountains.

The rivers of Sicily are numerous but are generally small. The three largest are the Symaethus, which flows round the west and south of Aetna; the Himēra, on whose banks the Carthaginians were defeated by Gelon in 480; and the Hālycus, which long continued to be the boundary between the Greek and the Carthaginian territories. Streams far smaller than these were not unknown to fame:—the Acis, connected with the story of Polyphemus and Galatea; the Anāpus (*Anāpo*), with a still smaller tributary which rises out of the blue depths of Rivers.



the fountain of Cýănē, and flows into the Great Harbour of Syracuse through tall papyrus-plants imported by the Arabs from the Nile. In Syracuse itself the fountain of Arethusa is still visible, as described by Cicero, near the southern extremity of the island (*Verr.* iv 118); while, on the coast, further to the south, is the Assinarus, the scene of the final catastrophe of the Athenian expedition to Sicily.

At the northern extremity of the eastern shore lay Messāna (*Messina*), with its port protected by a peninsula in the shape of a sickle, the local name for which led to the place being originally known as *Zanklē*. The new name, in its Doric form, was given by Anaxilas of Rhegium (d. 476 B.C.), in memory of his ancestors, who came from Messēnē in the south of Greece. In the straits, far nearer to Messana than to Rhegium, is a vortex or whirlpool, of 70 to 90 feet in depth, circling in swift eddies caused by the meeting of the currents in the narrow opening between the Tyrrhenian and Sicilian seas. This is the ancient *Charybdis*, while on the opposite side is *Scylla*, a rocky headland united by a narrow isthmus to the Italian shore, some 15 miles north of Rhegium, and almost exactly at the entrance to the straits. We have poetically exaggerated descriptions of both in the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid* (iii 420–8); while, in the *Alexandreis* (v 301) of Gautier de Lille (d. 1201), we find the proverbial line, ‘Incidis in Scyllam, cupiens uitare Charybdim’.

To the south of Messana were Naxos, Catāna and Leontini, all of them Chalcidian colonies; next followed the Hyblaeae Megara, famous for its honey; and, lastly, Syracuse, the great Dorian colony from Corinth. Founded on the island of *Ortygia*, it spread to the north over the lower and the higher portions of the broad and rugged mass of *Achradina*, with its fringe of precipitous cliffs abutting on the sea. The city also extended inland to the suburbs of *Temenitis* and *Neapolis*. To the north of these last, rose the large triangular table-land of *Epipolae*, with its apex at the fort of *Euryelus*, a point from which it slopes down for some  $3\frac{1}{2}$  miles, between low precipices to the north and south, until it terminates to the east in the cliffs of *Achradina*.

On the southern coast lay Camarina, and Gēla, and Agrigentum, Virgil's *arduus Acragas*, with its acropolis 1082 feet above the sea, and, farthest to the west, amid a maze of ruined temples, that poet's *palmasa Selinus*. In the north-western part of the island was Segesta with its theatre near the top of the hill, looking down on its single secluded temple, which was never finished, but is still almost perfect. Next follows the important Phoenician station of Panormus (*Palermo*) with its great harbour protected to the west by the huge mass of Mount Heircte, or *Monte Pellegrino*. In the centre of the island, on a table-mountain with steep sides, 2605 feet above the sea, lay Henna, with a sacred grove of Proserpine, not on the heights but far below, and, in the hollow of the great hills, a cavern, and a little lake with meadows once bright with

flowers, but now bare and desolate. To the Romans the most memorable historic sites in Sicily were the *insulæ Agâtes* off its western promontory, where the defeat of the Carthaginians put an end to the First Punic War (241), and the city of Syracuse captured by Marcellus in the Second (212). At the former date the island became a Roman Province, but it was not completely subdued until 210 B.C.

17. As compared with the prosperous island of Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, with which we close this survey of Italy and the adjacent islands, offer little to attract us. The climate of Sardinia. Sardinia was notoriously unhealthy. Pomponius Mela pointedly describes it as 'soli quam caeli melioris, atque, ut fecunda, ita paene pestilens' (ii 7, 19). It was to this island that Mela's contemporary, Seneca, was banished. The wormwood and bitter herbs of Sardinia were proverbial (Virgil, *Ecl.* vii 41), while the yew-trees of Corsica. Corsica gave a poisonous quality to its honey (*Ecl.* ix 30).

The latter island was peopled by Ligurians, and colonised by the Carthaginians, from whom it was taken by the Romans in 238, at the same time as Sardinia. In the middle of the east coast of Corsica lay the Greek settlement of Alalia or Aleria, afterwards colonised by Sulla. Large supplies of timber were produced by the dense forests which covered a rugged range of mountains rising to 8000 or 9000 feet, and ending at the northern extremity with a narrow ridge that extends 30 miles from the main body of the island, and may be clearly seen from the Etrurian, and even from the Ligurian, coast. Early in the fifth century, the Latin poet, Rutilius Namatianus, on his return from Rome to his native land of Gaul, viewed those mountains during his voyage along the Etrurian shore, passing on his way the iron mines of Ilva and the monastery of Capraria, and coming to port, at the end of his poem, in the harbour of Luna, which had been lauded by one of the earliest of Latin poets in the well-known line of Ennius:—'Lunai portum, est operae, cognoscite, ciues'. That harbour brings us back to the Ligurian coast, where we began our survey of the Italian peninsula, which may fitly close with a rendering of the Gallic poet's glowing description of his approach to the city built of the marble of Carrara, which now lies in ruins five miles from the entrance of the famous *Gulf of Spezia*:—

We swiftly glide 'neath walls of wondrous white,—  
Walls of a city named of Luna's light;  
With laughing lilies vies her sparkling stone,  
She softly gleams with marble all her own:  
With marble teems the land, whose lustrous glow  
Shames the rich radiance of unsullied snow.

The ancient texts bearing on the geography of the Italian peninsula include passages in the poets, e.g. Virgil's *Georg.* ii 135—176, and *Aen.* vii 641—817, and Rutilius Namatianus; and the formal descriptions in the *Periplus* of 'Scylax of Caryanda' (ed. Fabricius, 1878);

Bibliography.

Strabo, books v—vi; Pomponius Mela, ii 4 and 7 *ad finem*; and Pliny, *N. H.* iii 38—138. Many of the *loci classici* are printed in full in J. A. Cramer's *Ancient Italy*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1826; and in S. Butler's *Ancient Geography*, new ed. 1858; also in Addison's *Remarks on Italy in 1701–3*, and in Eustace's *Classical Tour*, 1812 etc.

Among modern works may be mentioned Cluverius, *Italia antiqua*, Leyden, 1624; H. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, vol. i, 1883; vol. ii in two parts, 1902; and J. Jung, *Geographie von Italien etc.*, in Iwan Müller's Handbuch, vol. III 465—565. On Sicily, the geographical literature quoted in Holm's *Geschichte Siciliens im Alterthum*, 3 vols. 1870–98, and in Freeman's *History of Sicily*, 4 vols., Oxford, 1891–4. On Syracuse, Holm and Cavallari's *Topografia archeologica*, Palermo, 1884; ed. Lupus, Strassburg, 1887; and Jordan and Haverfield's relief-map, Nutt, London, 1886. Cav. Cesare Pomba's relief-map of the whole of Italy and Sicily, and the neighbouring lands, on a scale of 1 : 1,000,000, is published by Paravia and Co. (Turin, etc.).

For Maps, besides those included in the ordinary Atlases (such as von Kampen's pocket-atlas, Gotha, 1893, and Kiepert's *Atlas Antiquus*), see esp. nos. xix—xxiii (1901–3) in Kiepert's *Formae Orbis Antiqui*, and his *Italia Centrale* in four sheets, scale 1 : 250,000 (1881); also G. B. Grundy's *Italia*, 2 sheets in one case, in Murray's *Handy Classical Maps*.

On ancient geography in general, cp. H. Kiepert's *Lehrbuch der alten Geographie*, 1878 (E. T., Macmillan, London, 1881); E. H. Bunbury's *History of Ancient Geography*, 2 vols. 1879, and his articles in Smith's *Dictionary*; also H. F. Tozer's *History of Ancient Geography*, Cambridge, 1897, and his *Primer of Classical Geography*, London, 1887.

## I. 2. ETHNOLOGY.

18. It has been generally held that Europe was first peopled by a non-Aryan race. Of course, it is impossible to say what were the physical characteristics of Palaeolithic men (*i.e.* those who made the oldest stone implements found in the fluvial gravels of most countries in Europe, including Italy). But when we come to Neolithic men (*i.e.* those who made the later stone implements, which are of much more advanced workmanship, being frequently highly polished), the problem becomes less hopeless. It has been generally held that the first Neolithic men in Europe, whether they were descended or not from their Palaeolithic predecessors, had long skulls and were not Aryans; that, subsequently, a migration of short-skulled people from Asia, probably Mongolians, passed along central Europe and into France, becoming what is commonly termed the *Alpine*, by some the *Ligurian*, by others the *Celtic* race; that, later, these two primitive non-Aryan races were overrun by the Aryans, and that from the latter they learned Aryan

Physical  
Charac-  
teristics,

speech. When these theories were first started, the Aryans were universally considered to have come from the Hindu Kush, but they are now generally believed, as held by Latham<sup>1</sup>, to have originated in upper central Europe. Yet, although the view respecting the cradle of the Aryans has changed, anthropologists have not seen its bearing on the problem of Early Man in Europe. Those who follow Latham believe that these short-skulled, non-Aryan immigrants from Asia learned Aryan speech from the blonde Aryans of upper Europe. Sergi<sup>2</sup>, on the contrary, holds that the short-skulled Alpine race were Aryans from central Asia, and that it was from them that the primitive dark-complexioned race of Italy and the blonde race of upper Europe learned their Aryan tongues; but he has nowhere refuted Latham's arguments. Ever since Sergi comprehended under what he terms the Eurafrian species all the dark-complexioned peoples of southern and western Europe, as well as the Semitic and Hamitic peoples of western Asia and northern Africa, the doctrine that the dark-skinned people of Europe once spoke a non-Aryan tongue or tongues, is supposed to have been finally established. But under his Eurafrian species Sergi includes the blonde race of northern Europe (which speak Aryan languages) along with the dark races of western Asia and northern Africa (which speak Semitic and Hamitic). But, though Sergi has recognised the relationship between the dark-complexioned Mediterranean race and the blonde race of northern Europe, which Latham and his followers hold to be the original Aryan stock, yet it has been tacitly assumed by all writers that no dark-skinned race could have spoken an Aryan (Indo-European) tongue from the outset.

But the criteria of a *race* which they have employed have been distinctly misleading. They have relied on (*a*) the colour of the hair, skin, and eyes, (*b*) the shape of the skull and certain other osteological characteristics, and (*c*) the system of descent through males. Formerly language was included amongst the tests of race, but ever since it was pointed out that the negroes of Jamaica speak English, those of Louisiana French, it was assumed that one race could adopt the language of another with the greatest ease. Yet language was too hastily expelled from the criteria of race, and too implicit faith has been placed on the criteria of cranial characteristics, pigmentation, and law of succession. The instances of the negroes in Jamaica and elsewhere are quite beside the mark, for slaves are compelled to take over the language of their masters, whereas we have to consider the conditions under which a whole race or people borrows the language of another.

(1) There is no evidence that any people ancient or modern, being themselves unconquered, has ever borrowed the language of their neighbours. Thus it is impossible to suppose that the Arcadians, who were never conquered by any invaders, adopted the Aryan tongue which they spoke in

<sup>1</sup> R. G. Latham, *Descriptive Ethnology* (1859), and *The Nationalities of Europe* (1863).

<sup>2</sup> Giuseppe Sergi, *The Mediterranean Race* (1901).



classical times and which comes nearest of all dialects to the language of the Homeric poems, the earliest form of Greek speech that has come down to us. Though the Swiss cantons are bound together by the closest ties of friendship, not one of them shows any tendency to adopt the language of any one of its neighbours.

(2) The adoption by a conquered people of the language of their conquerors is a rare occurrence, and, when it does take place, it is only after a long lapse of time. Thus, though the Angles have been in this island for fourteen centuries, the Cornish language has only recently died out, whilst Welsh not only survives but flourishes. Even when the language of the conqueror is taken over, so far from its being adopted in its entirety, the native tongue impresses itself indelibly both on the syntax and vocabulary of the borrowed tongue, and in cases of the adoption of an Aryan tongue by non-Aryans, the tense-system is always broken down. No better example is needed than 'pigeon' English.

(3) On the other hand, the conquering people adopts the language of the conquered almost invariably when they come in small bands of warriors without women of their own. This was the fate of the Normans in France, in England and in Ireland, of the descendants of Cromwell's Ironsides planted in Ireland without English women, of the Bulgars who have left their name in Bulgaria. To assume in face of these historical facts that the dark-complexioned races of Greece, Italy, Spain, the British Isles, France, and Holland adopted their Aryan tongues from a handful of Aryan conquerors, and took over the Aryan tense-system in its entirety, is to set history at defiance. But for this there is no need.

19. Sergi has assumed that because the dark aboriginal populations of the lands on the north side of the Mediterranean resemble in their complexion and in the shape of their skulls the Semites and the Hamites, they are therefore identical in

Climatic  
Laws.

*race*. But similarity of *type* does not mean identity of *race*. On the other hand, differences in complexion and stature, such as those between the Italians and the blonde race of north Germany, do not mean absolute difference in race. Thus the various members of the Horse family, if we follow them from the north of Asia and Europe down to the south of Africa, demonstrate that there is a constant variation, not only in coloration, but also in osteology, from latitude to latitude, every belt having its own particular type. First the old dun horses of northern Asia and Europe, turning white in winter, and with a tendency to turn white altogether, the best example of which probably was the now extinct pony of the Lofoden Isles, and Prejvalsky's Horse or true tarpan. Bordering on the latter are the Asiatic Asses, which vary from area to area, getting lighter in colour as we reach south-western Asia. Passing into Africa, we find the asses of Somaliland closest in form and coloration to those of Asia, and as we pass down Africa, similar variations are found taking place in the asses and zebras, until we reach the now extinct quagga of Cape



Colony. So too the tiger varies from region to region, from Bengal to Corea. It is admitted that, as we pass upwards from the Mediterranean, the population as a whole is getting lighter in colour until, on reaching the Baltic, we meet the most blonde and tallest race in the world. Yet the ancestors of this race must have passed upwards from the Mediterranean as the ice-sheet receded, and, as they advanced, they gradually grew lighter in complexion until, under the conditions which produce the white hare, white bears, and a tendency in the ptarmigan and the stoat to turn white in winter, and the like tendency in the dun horse, they gradually became the blonde race of our time. But, if they were speaking an Aryan language when they left the shores of the Mediterranean, there was no reason why they should not continue to speak the same tongue as their Aryan-speaking brethren whom they left behind them. Thus there is no difficulty in the view that the dark-skinned races of Italy and Greece have always spoken the same kind of language as the blonde people of the north.

20. The similarity in type of these dark Indo-European peoples to the Semites on the east and to the Hamites on the south side of the Mediterranean is explained without difficulty on ordinary zoological principles. The analogy from man in other parts of the world, as well as that of the Equidae, suggests that the resemblance between the Berbers, who speak Hamitic, the Italians and Greeks, who speak Indo-European, and the Jews and Arabs who speak Semitic, is simply due to the fact that those peoples, from having long dwelt under practically similar conditions in the Mediterranean basin, have gradually acquired that physical similarity which has led Sergi to the assumption that they have a proximate common ancestry, and that they accordingly form but a single *race*. There is no lack of examples of similar convergence of type under similar conditions in the case of the lower animals.

The asses of south-western Asia approximate in colour to those of north-east Africa, and, in respect of the size of the ears and the absence of a shoulder-stripe, more especially to the nearest of these, the ass of Somaliland. Yet it does not follow that the asses of south-western Asia are more closely related to the Somali ass than they are to their own next neighbours, the kiang, the wild ass of the Himalayas. It is much more likely that the Somali ass is closely related to its neighbours in Abyssinia, and the south-western Asiatic asses to the kiang. The approximation in colour, in the absence of shoulder stripe, and the size of the ears between the asses of Somaliland and those of south-western Asia must rather be explained by a convergence of types under the somewhat similar climatic conditions. Again, though there are very strong specific differences between the Grévy and Burchelline zebras, found in the neighbourhood of Lake Baringo in British East Africa, there is a curious approximation, not only in marking, but also in the teeth, between members of these two species, which is best accounted for by supposing that it is the outcome of a similar environment. It may be said that this approximation may be due to the in-breeding of the two species of zebras in the region where they overlap. But, from all that is known of the habits of wild species, and this is in itself a most unlikely contingency, it certainly cannot be alleged in the case of the convergence in type between asses of south-western Asia and the Somali ass, separated by the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. Again, the crocodile in the Ganges is distinguished by the extreme elongation of the head and jaws, whilst the same elongation

of the head is equally characteristic of the representative of the dolphin family found in the same waters. Moreover, in Cutch it has been long observed that all the larger animals have a tendency to become a sandy colour, whilst in certain areas of South America insects, no matter to what family they belong, have a tendency to one common aspect. It may of course be said that these changes in colour are for protection against foes, but in horses the coat-colours such as bay, black, gray, and white, accompany certain well-defined inward qualities. But as black is most certainly not a primitive horse-colour, it follows that coat-colours may be intimately connected with certain other characteristics quite irrespective of protection against foes. Again, as the variation in the size and shape of the ears and hoofs of the asses and zebras cannot be set down to protective colouring, but must be due to other causes, there is no reason why variations in colour should not be ascribed to similar causes.

21. We may therefore conclude that there need be no close relationship between the Indo-European-speaking, dark-complexioned, and long-skulled peoples of southern Greece, Italy, Spain, France, Holland, and the British Isles, and the Semites and Hamites, any more than there is any necessity for assuming that the short-skulled Alpine race is an immigrant from Asia. There can be little doubt that the Hamitic race was evolved in north Africa, and that the Semitic grew up in the Arabian Peninsula. The latter, in course of time, forced their way into Mesopotamia, Syria, and parts of anterior Asia, dispossessing or conquering the older populations. Along the shores of the Indian Ocean and in the interior of Asia Minor there are wide regions where the primitive peoples have long spoken Indo-European languages, *e.g.* the Baluchis, the Afghans, and, to come to Asia Minor, the Kurds, who must be regarded as the bottom stratum of population in all that region, though overlaid by invasions of Semites from the south and by Turcomans from the north. It is commonly assumed that all these peoples originally spoke non-Indo-European tongues, and only learned the Indo-European from Aryan conquerors, such as the Persians. But the Persian conquest came very late, and it is incredible that the Persians should have been able, in a very short time, to impress their language on wild mountain tribes, such as the Oreitai, who lived along the Indian Ocean, and who were in a most primitive state of culture, having no metal, and using stone implements. The evidence points to the existence of Indo-European peoples, from the earliest times, along the shores of the Indian Ocean eastward of Arabia, and it is probably from this area that the Indo-European race spread first in the stone age across Asia Minor, leaving an aboriginal Indo-European population there, whose modern representatives are the Kurds. They then, having reached the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, passed into the nearest islands and crossed by the Dardanelles into Europe, thenceforth spreading along the northern shores of the Mediterranean, and eventually passing north and following the ice-sheet, as it gradually receded, until some of them reached the shores of the Baltic. In the lapse of time, those who had settled in this area became different in physique and complexion, sociology and religion, from their relations south of the Alps. Then came the time

when these stalwart children of the north began to turn southwards and eastwards. After they had learned the use of copper and had begun the practice of cremating the dead, some of them advanced eastwards across southern Russia up the Oxus valley and so into northern India, where we meet them under the name of the Aryas of the Rig-Veda, whilst another body eventually turned south-west and became the Persians of history. The latter found, over a large part of what later became their empire, people who spoke tongues kindred to their own, although with very different religious and social customs. Thus the Medes, like the Oreitae, gave their dead to the wild beasts, and regarded the burning of the body with horror. Others of the fair-haired people from the north of Europe kept pressing down south, passing into Italy, the Balkans and Spain. These fair-haired people are known in modern parlance as Teutonic, but to the ancients always as *Keltoi* or *Galatae* (dialectic forms of the same word). Much confusion has arisen from the inaccurate use of the terms *Celt* and *Celtic*. Thus it is the practice to speak of the dark-complexioned people of France, Great Britain and Ireland as 'black Celts', although the ancients never spoke of any dark-complexioned people as Celts, for great stature and a xanthochrois complexion were to them the essential characteristics of the Celt or German. There was no distinction between Celt and Germans, for the people afterwards called Germans lived in the heart of the region especially assigned by the earlier writers to the Celts or Galatae. Moreover, in the earliest mention of the Germani (in the *Fasti Capitolini*), they are enumerated as forming a part of the Gallic army under Viridomārus, defeated at Clastidium (B.C. 225) by M. Marcellus ('triumphavit de Gallis Insubribus et Germanis isque spolia opima retulit duce hostium Viridomaro ad Clastidium interfecto'). According to Livy (xx 51-2) the Insubres had summoned from beyond the Alps 30,000 Gallic mercenaries armed with the *gaesum* (*gaesati*), and the Germani apparently contributed the whole or chief part of these auxiliaries. 'The women of the Gauls are not only similar in stature to the men, but are their rivals in deeds of valour. Their children at birth are white-haired (πολιά) for the most part, but as they grow older, they change to their fathers' complexion' (Diod. Sic. v 32, 1-5).

The story of the Greek, Italian, and Spanish peninsulas is virtually the same. In all three there is a long-skulled, dark-complexioned race, which has been there from Neolithic times. This race and especially that part of it which occupied Greece (and the contiguous Aegean islands) was and is still endowed with an exquisite sensibility for form and colour. This sense of material beauty is probably the outcome of the climatic conditions and the beautiful natural environment under which the race has developed. The sensuous character thus formed has an inevitable tendency to decline into sensuality and effeminacy.

22. The lower part of the **Balkan peninsula** was occupied by the race which still forms the chief element in its population, the race known to

the Greeks themselves as *Pelasgian*. North of Greece, the Balkan peninsula was occupied by the Thracians and Illyrians, between whom it is hard to draw any sharp distinction. They were close congeners of the Pelasgians (aboriginal Greeks). Not only is the same tribe sometimes regarded as Thracian, sometimes as Illyrian, but tribes (*e.g.* the Perrhaebi), commonly regarded as Greek, are sometimes spoken of by ancient writers as Illyrians, whilst there is no doubt that the Thessali, who gave their name to Thessaly, and the Dorians themselves, were Illyrian tribes. All these Thracian and Illyrian tribes tattooed, and had descent through women, in these respects being contrasted with the Keltoi. The Illyrians extended as far as the Alps along and round the top of the Adriatic. The Veneti, who have left their descendants, as well as their name, in Venice, were the most westerly tribe included amongst these. In north-east Italy, the Illyrians shaded off into the aboriginal dark-complexioned inhabitants of Italy, who were the Ligurians of history. These extended across upper Italy and into south-eastern France, shading off, in their turn, into Iberians, who occupied south-western France and most of the **Spanish peninsula**. But the Basques must not be included amongst the Iberians, for they are probably a spurt from northern Africa which got stranded in the western Pyrenees. Thus, in all three peninsulas, there is the same long-skulled, dark-complexioned, Indo-European race, and the story of the invasions of all three peninsulas is likewise practically the same. Into each of them there have been constant inroads of the fair-haired Indo-European race (commonly termed Aryans) developed under the more bracing conditions, moral as well as physical, of northern Europe. Thus, there was the great Celtic invasion and partial conquest of Spain in the sixth century B.C. The Celtic occupation extended continuously nearly as far south as Gades, and it is certain that some of their tribes, such as the Turduli and the Turdetani, settled in Baetica (Andalusia). The crest of the Celtic wave may even have dashed across the Straits into north Africa. In the mixed Celtiberian race there is sure evidence of the blending of the conquerors and the conquered in the upper part of Spain. Afterwards came Goths and Vandals. The Visigoths became the masters of Spain and from them the Spanish grandees, among whom fair hair is a common feature, derive their *sangre azul*. After a glorious struggle against the Saracen, which served to keep alive their martial ardour and thus brace up the ancient vigour of the race, from the sixteenth century onwards the Visigothic wave seems to have exhausted its initial energy. The aboriginal stratum has more and more come to the surface and thus left Spain sapless and supine.

23. Let us now pass to **Italy**. Dionysius mentions three peoples in upper Italy in the early period. First of all there were the *Aborigines*, as they are termed by Dionysius, who in this name follows Cato and still earlier writers. Secondly, there were the great tribes of *Umbrians* and *Siculans*. These two peoples seem to have been closely related, the Siculans being the earlier wave, which had advanced down from the



Alpine regions on the *Aborigines*, whilst their kindred Umbrian tribes were constantly pushing them further south. The *Aborigines* were continually being hard pressed by both Siculans and Umbrians, and those of them who had maintained their freedom dwelt, for the most part, along the Apennines, into which they had been driven from the richer lands of the plains. According to tradition, Greek settlers began to pass into upper Italy in the latter part of the second millennium before Christ. These settlers are described as *Pelasgians* driven out of Thessaly by the advance of tribes, such as the Achaeans, from the north. Some of them took refuge in Crete, and in other places, but the greater part moved west into Epirus. Thence some of them, in obedience to the oracle of Dodona, sailed subsequently for Italy, then called *Saturnia*. They were driven to the Spinetic (or southern) mouth of the Po, where they left their ships and the feeblest of the folk, with a guard to protect them. The rest marched inland into the territory of the Ombrici, who are described as occupying a wide area, and as being a great and ancient race. The Pelasgians captured some of the Umbrian towns (*πολίσματα*). But, when a large force of Umbrians advanced against the Pelasgians, the latter turned to the *Aborigines*, who at once prepared to repel this new enemy. The Pelasgians, however, made friendly overtures to the *Aborigines*, who being hard pressed by the Siculans accepted the alliance. The combined forces straightway captured the Umbrian town of Cortona, which they thenceforward used as a base for their operations against the Umbrians. The Pelasgians also aided the *Aborigines* against the Siculans, from whom they took many towns, which the Pelasgians and *Aborigines* jointly occupied. Of this number were Agylla (later known as Caere), Pisa, Saturnia, Alsion, and many others, of which they were afterwards to be deprived. As the Siculans and Umbrians were settled in towns, they cannot be regarded as mere barbarians. At the dawn of history the land of the Umbrians (*Ὀμβρική*) included all north-east Italy as far as the Alps (Herod. iv 49). On the other hand, the Siculans were continually being driven down south before kindred tribes advancing from the north. Some of them passed into Sicily, where they settled, and to which they gave their own name, after conquering or driving into the western parts of the island the Sicani, an Iberic tribe, who were the earliest occupants of that island (Thuc. vi 2). We may therefore infer with some probability that the Umbrians were the people who were in the act of driving south the Siculans, when the Greek settlers from Thessaly passed into Italy, having had to seek for new homes owing to the advance of the Achaeans into Epirus and Thessaly, part of which was still known as 'Pelasgian Argos' in the *Iliad*.

24. That the Siculans and the Umbrians were not the oldest occupants of northern Italy is clear, for the invading Pelasgians were joined by the *Aborigines*, who dwelt in the mountains. Aborigines. These *Aborigines* stood in the same relation to the Siculans and Umbrians as did the Sicanians to the Siculans and Greeks in Sicily at a later day.



Their position in the mountains indicates that they were the ancient possessors of the land, driven from the rich soil of the plains into the barren fastnesses of the hill country, just as the Sicanians maintained their independence in the western parts of Sicily, and as, at the present day, the Basques hold out in the mountainous regions of north-west Spain. Similarly, the small, dark, long-skulled race, who probably are the descendants of the people who dwelt in our own islands in the Neolithic and Bronze Ages, have survived in Wales, and are still especially strong in the mountainous parts of Scotland and Ireland, and particularly in the western districts. Such races are ever ready to welcome any invader who may aid them against their hereditary enemies. Thus the Sicanians assisted the Greeks against the Siculans, the Siculans in turn supported the Athenians against the Syracusan Greeks, whilst the Tlascalans of Mexico helped Cortes and his Spaniards to conquer the Aztecs, and the natives of the west of Ireland were only too ready to join the French against the English in 1798. The story of the *Aborigines* of Italy can thus be easily paralleled from the whole range of history, and there is no reason to doubt its substantial truth.

25. According to tradition, next came the invasion of the Lydian *Tyrsēni* from Asia Minor, for it is impossible to admit Tyrseni. Mommsen's view, that they were Raetians from the Alps. This view has no other foundation than Corssen's guess that the name *Rasenna* (found only once, and then probably an error for TRASENNA or TARASENNA) is identical with *Raeti*. Herodotus and all other ancient writers are agreed in representing them as settlers from Asia Minor.

Apparently both the Greek settlers and their allies, the *Aborigines*, were glad of the coming of the Tyrsenians, for they were in sore need of assistance against the ever-increasing encroachments of the Umbrian tribes. The new combination of Tyrsenians, Pelasgian settlers, and *Aborigines* was very effective in checking for a long period the advance of peoples from the Alps. For the Etruscans (Tyrsenians) are said to have conquered more than three hundred Umbrian towns (Plin. *N. H.* iii 8). Henceforth the Umbrians held their independence in only a portion of their once great territory. In later ages, this was still more reduced by Gallic conquests, until finally they only retained the district known in classical times as Umbria, though doubtless they formed an element in all north-eastern Italy up to the Alps.

26. But though the men from beyond the mountains had been checked, the day came when the *Celts*, the kinsfolk of the Celts. Umbrians, were to swarm over the Alps into the plains of the Po, as the Umbrians had done centuries before. In the time of Herodotus, the Celts (at least under that name) do not appear to have occupied any part of north-east Italy. But it does not follow that there had not already been an invasion on the part of the people whom Herodotus himself knew as Celts, a people who, according to him, lived round the

source of the Danube (iv 49) and in the west of Europe. Such an invasion, even on a considerable scale, would probably never reach the ears of the Greeks of that day. How far the Umbrians differed from their Celtic neighbours it is hard to say, except that the Umbrians were probably mixed with the aboriginal inhabitants. In speech at least Celts and Umbrians were very closely connected. That the fair-haired people of upper and central Europe were constantly gravitating southwards over the Alps, is readily proved. At all ages, of which we have historical record, this has been the case. Thus, during mediaeval times, Italy was the constant prey of invaders from Germany and France; in the later days of the Roman Empire, the Visigoths, Huns, Vandals, Ostrogoths and Lombards streamed down upon the fertile plains of the Po. At the end of the second century B.C. Italy had only been saved from the Teutons and the Cimbrians by the valour and discipline of the legionaries and the military genius of Marius. About the beginning of the fourth century B.C. the Celts crossed the Alps in great numbers, and by B.C. 390 the Etruscan power had suffered a catastrophe, from which it was destined never to recover, while even Rome herself, after the disaster on the Allia, fell for the moment into the hands of Brennus and his Gauls (B.C. 390). The Gauls wasted away in the malaria-smitten Campagna, whilst the main body, bought off by gold, retired from the southern side of the Tiber, but they established themselves as far south as Sena Gallica and Bononia. Some of them passed through Italy and even crossed into Sicily (Justin, xxviii 2, xxxviii 4, 7).

But there is good evidence for earlier settlements of Gauls, and those too on a large scale, in northern Italy. In the beginning of the sixth century B.C. the Bituriges (whose name still survives in *Berri*) were the most powerful tribe of Celtæ in Gaul, and their king Ambigatus was the paramount chief of all the Celtic tribes. To find an outlet for the superfluous population, Sigouesus, sister's son to Ambigatus, led a body into the Hercynian forest, whilst his brother Bellouesus led into Italy large levies from the Bituriges, the Aruerni, the Senones, the Aedui, Ambarri, Carnutes, and the Aulerci, who all settled in north-western Italy. Later followed a body of Cenomanni under their chief Elitouius, who occupied the lands previously held by the Ligurian tribe of Libui, of which Brixiae (Brescia) and Verona were the chief towns in after days. Still later, the Boii and the Lingones came over the Pennine Alps, and, as by that time all the region between the Alps and the Po had been occupied by their kinsfolk, they crossed that river by boats, and they not only drove the Etruscans, but even the Umbrians out of their territory. These peoples, however, were able to maintain themselves on the south side of the Apennines. Subsequently the Senones advanced further south, and even reached Clusium (*Chiusi*) in Etruria (Liv. v 34-5), but were not able to make any permanent settlement. In due time the shattered remains of the once powerful Etruscan confederacy fell before Rome, as did also the great

Samnitic tribes, the most vigorous descendants of the Umbro-Sabellian stock, whom we first meet at the dawn of history.

27. Besides the Etruscans and the Gauls, we hear in the historical period of another people, the Ligurians. This people had a firm foothold in north-eastern Spain, for it was under pressure from them that a body of Iberians from the river Sicānus settled in Sicily (Thuc. vi 1). The Ligyes, as they were termed by the Greeks, occupied the whole of what is now Provence, their most powerful tribe being the Salyes or Saluvii. In Italy they not only maintained themselves in the mountainous region of which Genoa may be regarded as the centre, but in all northern Italy they formed the main substratum of the population (the Libui and Stoeni being Ligurian tribes), whilst they seem to have been a large element in the Alpine region, shading off in north-east Italy into their close kinsmen the Illyrians. As they occupy the same mountainous area as that assigned to the *Aborigines* by Dionysius, and as Philistus of Syracuse says that the Ligyes were expelled from their homes by the Umbrians, there can be no doubt that the *Aborigines* of Dionysius and Cato are none other than the Ligyes of the Greeks, and the Ligures of the Romans.

28. As it has long been the fashion to treat as mere fictions, not only the traditions respecting the ancient inhabitants of Italy, preserved in the ancient writers, but also those respecting the Regal period of Rome, let us now test the credibility of these statements by the criterion of the actual material remains which modern excavations have brought to light, more particularly throughout Upper and Central Italy.

A survey of these remains, other than those of post-Roman date, will show (i) a series of remains associated frequently with Roman coins and Latin inscriptions—indubitable proofs that these belong to the Roman period. (ii) In certain places, as at Bologna, where the Gauls had settled after B.C. 390, are found graves containing the remains of men of large stature, with long iron swords, and other gear similar to those found on the battlefields, where Caesar defeated the Helvetii and Boii, also along the Alpine passes, and in the graves of Gaulish warriors in the valley of the Marne and elsewhere. These objects are often distinguished by a style of ornament well known wherever the Celts made their way in the centuries between B.C. 400 and A.D. 1, commonly termed the La Tène period, but by some 'Late Celtic'. (iii) At an earlier level than the remains just named, appear, for example at Bologna, a series of graves perfectly distinct, not only from those just described, but also from those of a still earlier period, by their shape, structure, decoration, and method of disposing of the dead. The true Etruscan tomb is a chamber entered by a door in the side, though this form is not found north of the Apennines, for, in the Etruscan cemetery at Certosa near Bologna, the graves have no side-entrance, but are large pits,

into which one has to descend from above. They are rectangular, with the long sides running east and west; they contain a large open chest with a lid fitted by iron nails. The skeleton lies within the chest with its feet to the east. Many are seated with arms and legs extended. The dead are never cremated, as was the practice of the Raeti of the Alps, a fact sufficient of itself to disprove Mommsen's assumption of the identity of the Etruscans and the Raeti. (iv) In the famous cemeteries at Bologna, below the graves last described, come a large series readily distinguished from those of all the later periods. All these belong to the early Iron Age, usually termed the Villanova period by the Italian archaeologists, from the discovery of a large number of its characteristic remains at the place of that name near Bologna. This culture forms part of the great early Iron Age culture of the Upper Danube region commonly known as the Hallstatt period. The antiquities of this culture are widely spread over Upper Italy, and differ essentially not only from those of the later period just described, but also from those of a still earlier epoch. They show a great advance in metal work. The cemeteries reveal cist-graves, the bottoms, sides and top being formed of flat unhewn stones, though sometimes there are only bottom and top slabs. The dead were burned; the remains are usually in urns, each grave containing, as a rule, but one ossuary. Sometimes the vessel is covered with a flat stone, or a dish, upside down, sometimes the urns are deposited in the ground without any protection. The vases are often hand-made, and adorned with incised linear ornament, but the bones, especially in later times, were often placed in bronze urns or buckets. Greek influences are seen at work in the region round the mouth of the Po, but here, as we have seen, the Pelasgians from Thessaly had planted Spina. Though iron is making its way steadily into use for cutting-weapons, flat, flanged, socketed and looped axes of bronze are found in considerable numbers. Brooches of many kinds, ranging from the most primitive safety-pin, fashioned out of a common straight bronze pin, such as those found at Peschiera on Lago Maggiore, through many varieties, are in universal use. Representations of the human figure are practically unknown, but models of animals of a rude and primitive kind are very common, being probably votive offerings. These are closely parallel to the bronze figures found at Olympia, where representations of the human figure are still comparatively rare. Almost all the Olympian bronzes of this type were found at the same level in one particular part of the Altis, near the Heraeum and Pelopium, and they belong to the Geometric (or Dipylon) period. Many brooches were also found at Olympia, and these too of types which can be paralleled in Italy. There can be little doubt that the Villanova culture had commenced in the Bronze Age, for, in a considerable number of cemeteries, belonging to that period, the dead were cremated and not inhumed, as was the normal rule in the preceding epoch to which we now pass. This difference in burial rites indicates *prima facie* a difference of race. The brooches were in use before the end



of the Bronze Age, as is shown by the discovery of primitive safety-pins in settlements of that period, as at Peschiera.

(v) The Italian antiquaries during the last half-century have collected a vast body of information respecting the earliest stages of human culture in northern and central Italy, and we are now conversant with its essential characteristics. The earliest stage is that revealed in the Lake-dwellings of the plains of the Po, usually termed Terramare. Terramara is a substance looking like a mixture of clay, sand and ashes, arranged in differently coloured strata—yellowish-brown, green, or black, found in large flattish mounds. These artificial deposits occur over the provinces of Parma, Reggio, and Modena. Agriculturists had long used these mounds for manure, but in 1861 Ströbel showed that they were really the sites of pile-dwellings. Like remains have now been discovered all over upper Italy, also in Latium, and even as far south as Tarentum. The antiquities found in these habitations show that their earliest occupants were still in the Neolithic period. There are vessels of earthenware, both large and small, and of manifold shapes, some of which correspond to the types found in the Balkan and Danubian regions and also in Spain. The larger vessels are of coarse clay roughly kneaded and quite unglazed. The smaller vessels are made of a finer paste with thin walls and a smooth blackish surface. There are many articles made of bone and horn, comprising needles, pins, ornamental combs, and other objects. Stone axes, chisels and spearheads are not common, but there are numbers of rubbers, mealing stones and grooved spheroidal stones. Of copper and bronze there are numbers of flat axes, awls, chisels, spearheads, knives, crescent-shaped razors, combs, pins and needles. The flat celt is the earliest type of metal axe, being modelled from the stone axe which it superseded. Iron is not yet known, neither is glass nor silver found, and indeed there is but one doubtful object of gold. In all the earlier habitations brooches, rings and bracelets are absent. From the evidence now to hand it is clear that these people dwelt in lakes and marshes, rearing pile-dwellings like the Stone and Bronze Age people of Switzerland, southern Germany, and many other parts of Europe. At the time of their first occupation of the oldest dwellings, the settlers were still employing stone for all cutting purposes, but at no long time afterwards they had learned to use copper, and later still bronze, for cutting, and other important implements, whilst stone was only retained for meaner purposes. Their dead were apparently buried in a contracted posture, lying on the side, or sometimes sitting. The Terramare civilisation is probably contemporary with that seen in the earliest strata at Hissarlik (Troy).

Now history tells us that a series of peoples corresponding to the different classes of material remains just enumerated, have in their turn played a rôle in the story of upper and central Italy. Romans, Gauls, and Etruscans in turn held upper Italy, and there can be no doubt that the above-mentioned classes i, ii, and iii represent the relics of the



Romans, the Gauls and the Etruscans. As period iv (Villanova) precedes the Etruscan, we have in the Villanova antiquities the remains of the Umbrian-Siculan tribes and their subjects. Behind the Villanova culture lies v (Terramare culture). But we learnt from Dionysius, and the older writers whom he follows, that upper Italy had been occupied by a people whom they termed *Aborigines*, and that these people had in part been conquered by the Umbrians. Now Philistus, as we have seen above (§ 27), tells us that the Ligyes were driven from their homes by the Umbrians and Pelasgians, from which it appears that the *Aborigines* of Dionysius are none other than the Ligyes or Ligurians so well known in Roman history. The *Aborigines* are said to have continued to hold their own in the Apennines, —in the very region in which the Ligurians of historical times have dwelt uninterruptedly,—extending from Genoa, not only to the Maritime Alps, but as far as the Rhone, though largely intermixed with Celtic tribes from beyond the Alps.

29. **The Ligurians** of Roman times were a small, active, hardy, dark-complexioned race. These Ligyes occupied all Narbonese Gaul at the time of the founding of Massilia (B.C. 600), for the Phocaeans obtained possession of the site of that famous town by the marriage of their captain to the daughter of the native Ligurian chief. Nor is there wanting good evidence that they had once occupied the Po region, as well as the Alpine districts. Down to the coming of the Gallic Cenomanni, the Libui, a Ligurian tribe, had occupied the region round Brixia (*Brescia*) and Verona, and they are probably to be regarded as forming all through the ages (whether Umbrian, Pelasgian, Etruscan, later Greek colonists, or Roman had the mastery) the main element in the population of all Italy.

Whilst it is quite possible and even probable, that the Umbrians and others occupied some of the pile-dwellings in later times, it is certain that these lacustrine buildings belonged primarily to the aboriginal people. This is proved by the fact that the region round Brescia and Verona, occupied by the Libui down to the coming of the Cenomanni, is especially rich in Terramare. As these habitations contain nothing characteristic of the Gauls, and had never been occupied by the Umbrians, we must ascribe them and their culture to the Ligurians. Just as the Ligyes shaded off into the Iberians on the west, so on the north-east they merged into the Illyrian tribes, who may also be regarded as their close kindred. Strabo carefully distinguishes the Ligurians from the Celtic tribes of the Alps, although he also tells us that their manner of life was identical with that of their neighbours.

Let us now examine the literary traditions of **Rome and Latium** and again test tradition by the evidence of the spade. The remains of a culture similar to that of the Terramare has been found in Latium. The legends alone are sufficient to indicate that there had been two or more races in that region from a very early time. It is more than likely that this explains much in the subsequent history of Rome, such as the origin of the Plebs

and its long and bitter struggles against the Patricians. The excavations of Dr Boni in the Forum have revealed two different ways of disposing of the dead—cremation and inhumation—of itself an indication of the existence of two races with different views respecting the soul. In Latium, as in the region north of the Tiber, we hear of Aborigines, Siculi and Pelasgi, though the Umbrian name, as such, does not appear. This fact is readily explained, since the Siculi, as already pointed out, were the advance guard of the Umbro-Celtic peoples from beyond the Alps, and on them the Umbrians, properly so called, were pressing down at the dawn of history. But probably none of the latter had entered Latium until the time when the Sabini, one of the great Umbro-Sabellian stock, first passed into that region. Whilst the accounts of the ethnology of Italy north of the Tiber are clear and harmonious, the same cannot be said of the early traditions of Latium. The various statements preserved in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who drew his information from older authorities (e.g. Cato and Varro), are confused and apparently contradictory. Let us first start with the *Aborigines*. This name can mean nothing save an autochthonous race, and can never have been a tribal name. It was already in use at the beginning of the third century B.C., for it was employed by Callias (*fl.* B.C. 284); while Lycophron, who derived his knowledge of Rome from Timaeus of Locri (*fl.* B.C. 300), seems to allude to them under the form *Borigini*, among whom it was predicted that Aeneas should settle. Cato says that the chief part of the plain in the land of the Volsci had formerly belonged to the *Aborigines*. He also states that the *Aborigines* dwelt about Carseoli and Reate, and were driven thence by the Sabines, who had advanced from Aquila. Varro (himself a native of Reate) enumerates the names of their towns and says that their sites were still to be seen. Their capital, Lista, had been taken by surprise, and, as the attempts which they had made to recover it for many years had proved fruitless, they withdrew from that district down the Anio. The Siculi were then in possession of Tibur, Antemnae, Ficulea, Tellena, Crustumerium, and Aricia. These the *Aborigines* either subdued or expelled. Varro says that the *Aborigines* had joined the Pelasgians, and had aided them in driving out the Siculi. After this the Pelasgians withdrew and dispersed. The story of the alliance between the *Aborigines* and settlers from Greece is exactly the same as that in the country north of the Tiber, where we have identified the *Aborigines* with the Ligurians, and there is no reason why the same should not have taken place in Latium, where remains similar to the Terramare culture are also found. This accounts for several apparent difficulties in the statements. Some writers held that the *Aborigines* were Pelasgians; others, like Cato and Sempronius, said that the *Aborigines* were Achaeans; Varro, as we have seen, said that after the conquest of the Siculi by the combined Pelasgians and *Aborigines*, the Pelasgians withdrew. This statement probably means that the Pelasgians in no long time merged into the much more numerous Ligurian population. This they would do all the more

readily as they were probably from the same ethnic stock as the *Aborigines*. Indeed Dionysius says that the *Aborigines* had received the Pelasgians on terms of equality through hope of assistance, and especially on grounds of kinship. Both were part of the dark-complexioned, long-skulled race, and probably both spoke closely related dialects. Now the Pelasgian settlers at Falerii were said to have come under the leadership of Halaesus, son of Agamemnon. In the Homeric poems the people of Argolis are often called Achaeans as well as Danaans and Argives, for though the population was Pelasgian, the ruling dynasty was Achaean. It was therefore not unnatural that the nomenclature of settlers from Argos during the Achaean domination should show signs of fluctuation similar to those in Homer. By the time of the Dorian conquest the name Achaean was so deeply rooted in parts of Peloponnesus that, though the refugees from Argolis and Laconia were largely of Pelasgian blood, nevertheless they were called Achaeans in their new homes both in Peloponnesus (Achaia) and also in Magna Graecia (the Achaean colonies). The same seems to have been the case in Latium and Etruria. There is therefore no real contradiction (as Niebuhr thought) between Varro and Cato. Cato spoke of the settlers from Greece as Achaeans, while Varro gave them their older racial name of Pelasgians. In all the region north of the Tiber, the aboriginal Ligurian population apparently regularly buried their dead, whilst the Umbrians cremated theirs. Accordingly, when we find these two methods of disposing of the dead in the Roman Forum, it is not unlikely that in these two sets of graves we have the remains of the *Aborigines* or Ligurians, and of the Umbro-Siculan respectively. The story of a Pelasgian settlement in Latium is supported by the legend of Evander and his Arcadians. Pausanias (viii 43, 2) relates that Evander was the best of the Arcadians both in council and in war; and that he set out at the head of a band of Arcadians from Palantium and built a city by the river Tiber. In the legend of the union between Aeneas and Latinus (king of the *Aborigines*), the eponymous hero of the Latins, against the Rutuli and their fierce king Turnus, there is an echo of one of those many combinations between the newcomers and the indigenous tribes against the Siculan and Umbrian clans. The *Aborigines* of Carseoli and Reate had probably been driven from the plain into the mountains by the Siculi, and being constantly pressed by the Sabines, another of the ever-advancing tribes of Umbrians, would gladly hail any alliance with new settlers, by whose aid they might succeed in overcoming their ancient foes and recover at least a portion of their lost lands. Thus, according to Roman tradition, the Latini were the *Aborigines*, or, in other words, Ligurians, a tradition of great significance in view of the fact that the *populus Romanus* spoke, not the *lingua Romana*, but the *lingua Latina*. Romulus and his brother are represented as descended from Lavinia the daughter of Latinus, king of the *Aborigines*. But to that wonderful alloy out of which the Romans were to develop, another element, and that the most important, had to be added.

30. The Sabines had driven the *Aborigines* from Reate and Carseoli and the surrounding district, in the central Apennines. This region became the Sabine land of the classical period. It was here that the simple, frugal, and uncorrupt manners of life lingered, when the morals of Rome had sunk low. According to the legend, it was from hence that Romulus provided his men with Sabine wives. A war ensued between Romulus and Titus Tatius, the Sabine king of Cures, which resulted in the union of the two peoples under the two kings, the combination leading to the two classes of *Titienses* and *Ramnenses*. There is strong evidence that the Sabines were racially distinct from the aboriginal Ligurians, being one of the many tribes of the Umbro-Sabellian or *Sapine* stock. In the high lands in the heart of the Apennines, they and their kindred, the Vestini, Peligni, Marrucini and Marsi, continued to preserve the pristine vigour of their race. Many proofs can be adduced to show that the Patricians were Sabines, the Plebeians the aboriginal Ligurians conquered by the former, whilst it can also be shown that Latin, the language of the Roman Empire, was the tongue not of the Sabine conquerors, but of their Plebeian subjects, in other words, that Latin is Ligurian.

31. (1) Down to the latest times the three *Flamines maiores* were bound to be Patricians. These *flamines* were *Dialis*, *Martialis* and *Quirinalis*. But the gods whom they served were all Sabine divinities, according to the testimony of Varro and others.

32. (2) There were at Rome three kinds of marriage—*confarreatio*, *coemptio*, and *usus*. The two latter were purely civil, *usus* being merely the particular application of the Roman law of prescription, whilst *coemptio* was a survival of the widespread custom of wife-purchase. *Confarreatio*, on the other hand, was a solemn religious ceremony performed by the *flamen Dialis* and the *Pontifex Maximus*. Divorce was well nigh impossible in this last kind of marriage, though in the two others it was as easy as in modern Oriental countries. As the *flamines maiores*, who were bound to be Patricians, were also bound to be born of ‘confarreatic’ marriages and be thus married themselves, whereas the *flamines minores*, who were Plebeians, had no such restriction, we may infer that *confarreatio* was the Patrician rite, *coemptio* and *usus*, Plebeian. As strictness of married life remained down to imperial times characteristic of the Sabines, the rigid form of marriage introduced into Rome by the Sabine Numa Pompilius was certainly Sabine in origin. The high ideal of conjugal life, disclosed in the Patrician, *i.e.* the Sabine, doctrine of ‘confarreatic’ marriage, from which there was no divorce save death, finds no parallel anywhere except among peoples commonly termed Teutonic by the moderns, but *Keltic* by the ancients, and among the Homeric Achæans, who were a tribe from central Europe which had made its way down into Greece, bringing with them the use of iron, the round shield, the brooch, the practice of burning the dead, and the style of



decoration known as the Geometric, all of which are also characteristic of the Umbrian tribes of upper Italy. They likewise brought with them into Greece a higher ideal of wedded life and the doctrine of the 'sacred marriage' (ἱερὸς γάμος), identified by Dionysius with the Roman *confarreatio*. The use of a cake in the ceremony presents a striking analogy to the wedding-cake of northern Europe. Succession through males is alike characteristic of the Teutonic peoples, the Romans, and the Homeric Achaeans, amongst whom each chief has succeeded his father and expects his own son to succeed him. But it is only where monandry is firmly established, that this mode of succession can flourish, for where there is looseness in the relations between the sexes, owing to the uncertainty of the paternity of the offspring, succession must be reckoned through the mother. At Rome *agnatio* and *patria potestas* stand out prominently, and this must be ascribed to the element in the state which held marriage to be a sacred bond. On the other hand, female succession can be proved both for the aboriginal population of Latium and for the undoubted Ligurians. Thus the Plebeian form of marriage is quite in harmony with the ancient law of succession amongst the *Aborigines*. If then the Plebeians were Ligurians, they naturally looked on marriage very differently from the Sabine Patricians.

33. (3) The people of the Terramare culture (Ligurians) appear to have buried their dead, whilst the Umbrian tribes regularly burned theirs, and evidence of both customs has appeared in the Roman Forum. Moreover, although, in historical times, cremation was regularly practised by the upper classes at Rome, nevertheless the poorer classes buried their dead, partly perhaps because interment was cheaper than burning. But poverty will not account for it altogether. Some very old Roman families always continued to bury their dead. Both Cicero and Pliny held that inhumation was the most ancient custom. The dual forms of disposing of the dead and two kinds of marriage prove that the population of Latium was mixed. The earliest inhabitants of southern Italy, who were of the same stock as the Ligurians, always interred their dead, whilst on the other hand the Umbrians always practised cremation. But as the Sabines belonged to this later layer of population, it was probably with the Sabines that cremation came into Rome. Certainly one Patrician gens of undoubted Sabine origin—the Appii Claudii, the haughtiest of all Patricians, who were descended from the Sabine chief Attus Clausus, always cremated their dead.

Disposal of the  
dead.

34. (4) Before the Constitution of Servius Tullius, only Patricians served in the army. According to Festus, all who had a property rating of less than 120,000 asses = 10,000 libral asses = 100 cows, were once described as 'unclassified' (*infra classem*), that is to say not in the *classis*, i.e. not enrolled for military service. In old Latin, *classis* = *exercitus*, the army. From this it would follow that, in early days, there was only one *classis*, that is, the body of full citizens, all others being described as *infra classem*, i.e. not permitted to bear arms.

Armature.



After the reforms of Servius there were five *classes*. According to Dionysius and Livy, the First Class was equipped with bronze helmet, breastplate and greaves, and carried a round shield (*ἀσπίς*, *clipeus*), a spear and a sword; the Second bore the oblong shield (*θυρεός*, *scutum*) instead of the round shield, and wore no breastplate; the Third also bore the *scutum* and had neither breastplate nor greaves; the Fourth had the *scutum*, sword and spear; the Fifth bore only javelins (*σάββα*) and slings. Thus it was only the First which had complete armour, and bore the round shield, all the rest who had shields bearing the *scutum*. To the 80 centuries of the First Class were added 18 centuries of *Equites*, and the Roman *Equites* down to a late epoch bore a round shield with a central boss. But, as the round shield with a boss was essentially characteristic of upper Europe, while the oblong shields, such as the Mycenaean, the Boeotian, the old Arcadian, the *ancile*, and the *scutum*, were indigenous in Mediterranean lands, it follows that the 98 centuries of the First Class bore the characteristic shield of the Early Iron and Bronze Ages of central and upper Europe, whilst the inferior Classes, who wore only partial armour, carried the *scutum* distinctive of the South. These facts, even without other evidence, suggest that the First Class represented the ruling aristocracy in a community composed of conquerors and their subjects. But as the Umbrians carried the round shield, and the Sabines were Umbrians, and as the round shield was that borne by the Roman *classis*, which was composed wholly of Patricians, down to the time of Servius, the inference is irresistible that the Patricians were Sabines.

35. (5) Tradition and archaeology indicate that the basis of the population of Latium, as well as that of all upper Italy, was and is still Ligurian. But as it frequently happens that it is the language of a large conquered majority, and not that of a conquering minority, which ultimately prevails, the Latin language is probably that of the Ligurian Plebeians, and not that of the Sabine Patricians. The linguistic phenomena of Latin, when compared with those of the Umbro-Sabellian languages, render this very probable. Latin represents Indo-European *q* by *c* or *qu*, whilst Umbrian, Sabellian, and Oscan represent original *q* by *p*, e.g. Latin *quatuor* (from which come such names as *Quartus*, etc.); Umbrian and Oscan *petur* (cf. Gallic *petor-ritum*, 'four-wheeler'), from which come such names as *Petronius*, *Petreius*, *Petrilius*). Again, Latin *quinque* (*Quinctius*, *Quintilis*, and *Quintilius*, etc.) = Umbrian and Oscan *pumpe* (*Pontius* = *Pomptius*, *Pompeius*, *Pompilius*, the Gentile name of Numa the Sabine king of Rome). But Latin, like Greek, shows sporadic instances of complete labialism, e.g. *lupus* instead of *lucus* (cf. Greek *λύκος*). As *hirpus*, the Samnite and Sabine name for the wolf, shows labialism, it has naturally been inferred that such forms as *lupus* were introduced into Latin from some of the Umbro-Sabellian tribes. But, from the facts before us, it would seem that it was the Sabines who brought such forms into Rome.

Hence it is highly probable that the Romans of the classical time were an amalgam in which the chief elements were the aboriginal Ligurian inhabitants of Latium, and the Sabines, one of the tribes from central or upper Europe. Besides these there was probably a small element of Siculan, Pelasgian and Etruscan settlers, evidence of which is found in the *Lucæres*, who, along with *Titienses* and *Ramnenses*, formed a third class in the early period.

36. The story of Campania is much the same as is that of Latium. The chief tribes of *Aborigines* appear to have been the Opici, Campania. the Ausônes and Aurunci. At an early date Pelasgians from Chalcis in Euboea settled there and founded Cumæ. Later came Tyrrheni, who established themselves in great force, and whose capital, Capua, became the greatest city in Italy until destroyed by the Romans (B.C. 212). But, on the rich coast-plain, the Samnites had long kept pressing, and one of their tribes, the Osci, finally occupied a large part of it. Cumæ herself was captured by the Samnites in B.C. 420.

37. There can be little doubt that the original inhabitants of Southern Italy were closely related to the occupants of the upper part of the peninsula at the same date. The history of the South Southern Italy. is parallel to that of the North. As the North was overrun and conquered by the Italic tribes from the Alps, and later by the Gauls, so the *Aborigines* of the South were invaded from time to time in like fashion, and more and more as time went on. But, in the earlier period, the *Aborigines* of the South suffered more by invasions from the opposite coasts of the Adriatic. These were of two kinds. Some of the invaders were from Greece, such as the Peucetii who settled on the eastern side, and the Oenotrians, who occupied the region extending to the western coast; others, such as the Chaones, who settled on the gulf of Tarentum, were probably part of the great Illyrian tribe of that name. The Iapygians, who occupied a large district of the later Calabria, were probably part of the tribe of Iapôdes, who dwelt on the north-east coast of the Adriatic. But whether they came by sea, or passed down by land along the east coast of Italy, is not clear. From the Iguvine Tables it is certain that a people of similar name (*Iapusko*) were a constant danger to the Umbrians of Iguvium, and they probably dwelt in Picenum. They may have crossed here from Illyricum, whilst others of their race may have coasted further down and settled in what was called from them Iapygia. The legend that Daunus, the eponymous hero of the Daunii, a chief tribe of Iapygia, had come from Illyricum, points distinctly in this direction. On the other hand, a large body of traditions points clearly to settlements from Arcadia in Iapygia and in the region west of it. The Peucetii of Iapygia, and the Oenotrii, who occupied the region to the west, were both said to have come from Arcadia and to have been Pelasgians. This is confirmed by the fact that the serfs of the later Greek colonists in this region were termed *Pelasgi* (Steph. Byz.). So, in later times, when the population of Bruttium, con-

sisting of *Aborigines*, Oenotrii, and Siculi, were reduced to villenage by the Samnite Lucani, the name *Brettios* seems to have become equivalent to *slave* (cp. Helots, Penestae, etc.). The recent discovery, at Morfetta near Bari in the ancient home of the Peucetii, of Neolithic pottery similar to that found in central Greece seems to confirm the legend that the Peucetii had come from Greece. At an early period the Siculi, the first wave of invasion from the North, had already advanced to the southern extremity of the peninsula, from which many of them crossed into *Sicania*, thenceforth to be called *Sicilia*. From the *Itali*, one of their tribes, who settled along the coast, the south-west peninsula gained its name *Italia*, destined to become that of the whole region up to the Alps. The Siculi were already in force in southern Italy (about B.C. 1000), when the *Odyssey* had been composed (cp. *Od.* xvii 383, xxiv 211).

38. The Pelasgian and Illyrian settlers had preceded by a long time the settlements from Greece which followed, consequent upon the Dorian invasion. In the eighth century B.C. Ionians from Chalcis in Euboea planted Rhegium (B.C. 725). Then followed the so-called Achaean colonies, —Sybaris (B.C. 720), Croton (B.C. 710), Metapontum (about B.C. 700), Poseidonia, and many others. Finally, Velia was founded by Phocaeans (B.C. 540). The whole of this coast-region was so completely occupied by the Greeks, and so great was their influence on the older inhabitants of the Hinterland, that the region became known as *Magna Graecia*.

39. The Samnite tribes had long occupied Campania and kept steadily pressing down South, especially the great tribes of Lucani, Apuli and Hirpini, the two former of which gave their names to Lucania and Apulia. By the middle of the fourth century almost the whole region, down to the Strait, had been subdued by these invaders. Some of them, such as the Mamertines, following the example of their kindred Siculi, even crossed the Strait and settled in Messina. Some of the Gauls in the great invasion of B.C. 390 likewise reached the Strait and crossed into Sicily. When Tarentum fell, in B.C. 272, Rome became mistress of all Southern Italy. But the climatic conditions were almost as unfavourable to the Samnites as they had already been to the Gauls and as they were destined to prove to the Normans in the same region. By the close of the Republic the Samnite element in southern Italy had greatly dwindled and the main factor in the population, then as now, was the dark-complexioned aboriginal race of the southern peninsulas.

Montelius, *La Civilisation primitive en Italie*, 2 vols., 1895; W. Ridgeway, *Bibliography. The Early Age of Greece*, 2 vols., 1901—; *Who were the Romans?* 1908. On the archaic necropolis in the Roman Forum, see G. Boni, in *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1902-5 and Ch. Huelsen, *The Roman Forum*, pp. 210—217, E.T., Rome, 1906; ed. 2, 1909. George Dennis, *The Cemeteries of Etruria*, ed. 3, 1883; W. H. (Bullock) Hall, *The Romans on the Riviera*, 1898; W. Wright, *Hunterian Lectures*, and G. Retzius, *Huxley Lecture*, 1909. Older views in Mommsen's *History of Rome*, vol. i; Sergi, *The Mediterranean Race*; Ripley, *Races of Europe*; and T. E. Peet, *The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy*.

## I. 3. TOPOGRAPHY OF ROME.

40. To gain a clear idea of the topography of Rome, it will be best to follow, in its main outlines, the history of its gradual development. The Palatine hill, the nucleus of the city, was no doubt occupied by the original settlers owing to the natural advantages of its position. It was almost entirely surrounded by abrupt cliffs rising from deep valleys, swampy at the bottom, and frequently flooded by the Tiber; and was only connected at a single point with the table-land on the north, by the ridge of the Velia, at its NE. corner. The hill, with its two summits, Palatium and Cermalus (though the former name was in practice extended over the whole hill), is roughly rectangular in shape, and was hence called *Roma Quadrata*. Its original area was some 25 acres. The cliffs were scarped, and a shelf cut some 40 feet below their summit; upon this a wall of brown tufa blocks, quarried from the hill itself, was built to the height of two Roman feet, and considerable remains of this wall still exist on the W. and S. sides of the hill. It has been objected that, owing to the use of the foot of  $11\frac{5}{8}$  English inches, and the general similarity to the 'Servian Wall', this wall cannot be of greater antiquity than the latter. If this objection holds good, we must suppose it to be the fortification of an internal citadel. There are, indeed, scanty traces of an earlier wall of thinner gray tufa blocks (the so-called *capellaccio*, much used in the earlier buildings of Rome), perhaps attributable to the 6th or, at any rate, to the 5th century B.C. The line of the *pomerium*, followed by the Luperi in the time of Tacitus (*Ann.* xii 24), ran outside the wall at the base of the cliffs. There were three gates:—on the NE. the *Porta Mugonia*, from which the *Sacra Via* started; on the W. the *Porta Romanula*; and, on the SW., a nameless gate at the *Scalae Caci*<sup>1</sup>.

Palatine.

41. The first extension of this settlement, towards the E. and S., formed the *Septimontium*<sup>2</sup>. The seven *montes* included in this city were, the two summits of the Palatine (Palatium and Cermalus), the Velia, the Fagutal, Oppius and Cispius (these three all parts of the Esquiline) and finally the Caelius. Septimontium.

<sup>1</sup> The number is given by Pliny (*N. H.* iii 66), and the names by Varro, *L. L.* v 164. It has recently been suggested, however, that the *Scalae Caci* may have led down to the *Porta Romanula* (cp. *Classical Quarterly*, ii 1908 p. 145).

<sup>2</sup> A recent theory rejects the Palatine as the nucleus and the *Septimontium* as a stage in the development of Rome, holding that the first city proper and the first *pomerium* correspond to the city of the four regions (see below) (J. B. Carter in *Am. Journ. Philol.* 1907, 325; *Am. Journ. Arch.* 1908, 172; *Proc. Am. Philol. Soc.* 1909, 129). But Hülsen, *Geogr. Jahrb.* 1911, 192, urges that it is very difficult to conceive of seven separate communities within so small a space.



In Festus (pp. 341, 348 Müller) we find both the Caelius and the Subura mentioned, making eight names instead of seven. The latter has by some modern writers been taken to refer to the valley between the Viminal and Esquiline, which was known as *Subūra* in historical times, or to the hillside above it (A. Schneider, *Römische Mitteilungen* 1895, 160 f); by others (who generally prefer the form *Sucusa*, as in *pagus Sucusanus*), to a part of the Caelian hill, retaining Caelius as an explanation of this unusual sense (S. B. Platner, *Classical Philology*, I, Chicago, 1906, 69 f); while others again strike out Subura and retain Caelius. The name *Esquiliae* thus arose in reference to the settlements on the opposite hills in their relation to the original Palatine city (*esquilinus* being the converse of *inquilinus*).

Of the fortifications of the *Septimontium* no remains are known, though the *murus terreus Carinarum*, mentioned by Varro (*L. L.* v 48), has been conjectured to form a part of them. The prehistoric cemetery, discovered near the temple of Antoninus and Faustina in 1902, lay outside the *Septimontium* and appears to belong to it rather than to the original settlement on the Palatine. For the period, during which interments took place, probably ranged from the 8th to the 6th century B.C.; and it is to the middle of the 6th century B.C. that tradition assigns the construction of the *Cloaca Maxima* by the Tarquins, before which it is impossible that the Forum can have been used as a market-place. Nor can we now accept the conjecture that the walls of the *Septimontium* extended to the site of the temple of Janus, which, on this theory, would have originally been the *belli porta* (the gate towards the enemy). On the other hand, its inclusion within the city boundary must have been a consequence of the fusion of a Sabine settlement on the Quirinal with the original community, and the selection by the united body of the Capitol as their citadel (*arx*) and the seat of the *templum Iouis Optimi Maximi*. Traces of another (and perhaps still earlier) cemetery have been found in the middle of the open area of the Forum near the base of the equestrian statue of Domitian (*Notizie degli Scavi*, 1906, 50).

The Viminal (between the Quirinal and the Esquiline) and the Caelian (or the remaining portion of it) no doubt became parts of the city, either simultaneously with, or not long after, the changes just dealt with; and the result was the city of the four regions described by Varro:—the *Suburana*, *Esquilina*, *Collina*, and *Palatina* (*L. L.* v 45 f). Among these were distributed the *sacraria Argeorum*, eleven of which, out of twenty-seven, can be located fairly certainly. These regions did not cover the whole area enclosed by the 'Servian' wall: and the existence of an intermediate City of the Four Regions may be inferred (*a*) from the so-called calendar of Numa (Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 27 f), (*b*) from the fact that the *pomerium* followed the limits of the four regions, and not those of the 'Servian' city. Wissowa (in Pauly-Wissowa, ii 689 f) may be right in assigning the origin of the Argei to the 3rd century B.C., but even so the positions of the *sacraria* may be used as evidence for the course of the *pomerium*.



42. The next stage in the development of the city is marked by the 'Servian' wall, which, on the W. and E., coincided with the *pomerium* (the Capitol lying outside the four regions, but within the *pomerium*), while, on the N. and NE., it included a great portion of the table-land from which the Quirinal, Viminal and Esquiline originate, and on the S. it took in the Aventine, which remained outside the *pomerium* until the time of Claudius. It thus enclosed what came to be known, at any rate in the time of Cicero, as the seven hills of Rome—the Palatine, Capitoline, Aventine, Caelian, Esquiline, Viminal and Quirinal.

'Servian'  
Wall.

The early history of the Aventine is obscure. A. Merlin (*L'Aventin dans l'antiquité*, 1906) believes that it was occupied in very early days by a Ligurian colony, to which it owed its name. The fact that we find it frequently opposed to the Palatine in early legends, especially in that of the foundation of Rome, and that long before 456 B.C. (the traditional date of the *lex Icilia de Aventino publicando*) it had become the public domain of the community, would seem to indicate that it had been conquered by the inhabitants of *Roma Quadrata* at a very early date, and not incorporated in the city. Ancus Martius, for example, is said to have settled there the inhabitants of certain conquered Latin towns. The *lex Icilia* reclaimed this public domain, which had been usurped by private citizens, and established plebeians there, but especially, according to Merlin, foreign merchants.

The 'Servian' line of fortifications was laid out with considerable skill, following, where possible, the edge of the cliffs of the various hills, the wall being there constructed on the same system as that of the Palatine with blocks of similar size. Where it had to cross the table-land, from which the Quirinal, Viminal, and Esquiline originate, it was necessary (for a length of nearly a mile) to adopt a more complicated system of defence. A ditch, 30 Roman feet deep and 100 wide, was dug, and the earth thrown up on the city side; this was supported by a massive wall on the top of the ditch, and sometimes at the back by a smaller wall. The whole was known as the *agger*; and several weak points of the circuit were strengthened in the same way. The river banks were also fortified. The date of the construction of these walls has been much discussed, and, largely owing to the use of the foot of 11 $\frac{5}{8}$  inches, is by some authorities (without denying that previous defences existed) assigned to the period immediately following the Gallic invasion of 390 B.C. The latest exposition of this view may be found in O. Richter, *Beiträge zur römischen Topographie* (1903, i 14 f)<sup>1</sup>. A further difficulty is caused by the tombs found within the line of the wall, which begin in the 8th century B.C., while the latest of them go down to the 4th century B.C. In one case on the Quirinal the entrance to one of the latest tombs is said to have been blocked by the wall (Pinza, in *Mon. dei Lincei*, xv 750). The provision

<sup>1</sup> A more recent investigator, however, P. Graffunder, has detected the presence of many blocks in which the Oscan foot of 11 English inches is employed. He infers that two periods may be distinguished:—the original, of the second half of the 6th century B.C., and the second, shortly after 390 B.C. Cp. *Klio*, xi (1911) 83 f. His conclusions, however, are rendered doubtful by the existence at several points along the line of the 'Servian' wall of traces of an earlier wall of *capellaccio*, like that of the Palatine, and probably of the same date (Delbrück, *Apollo-tempel*, 11 f).

against intramural burial in the Twelve Tables, however, must imply that it was not positively unknown (cp. Marquardt, *Privatleben*, 360).

An outpost on the right bank, at the summit of the Janiculum, may have existed as early as the city of the *Septimontium*. It was connected with the city by the *Pons Sublucius*, the antiquity of which is shown by the fact that it was constructed entirely of wood, without the use of metal nails, and that the use of metal was forbidden in subsequent repairs down to historic times. It was, however, the 'Servian' city which first came down to the Tiber and began to make full use of it as a water-way. The establishment of the *Forum Boarium* and the erection of temples and other buildings in it presuppose the existence of the *Cloaca Maxima* and the *Cloaca* of the valley of the *Circus Maximus*. It is a much discussed question whether the *pons Sublucius* made use of the island of the Tiber (as Mommsen supposed), or crossed the river from the *Forum Boarium*, so that its commencement on the left bank lay within the 'Servian' city. In the latter case the bridge leading to the island from the left bank must date at latest from the establishment of the worship of Aesculapius in 291 B.C., but when the connexion of the island with the right bank was established is uncertain. The next bridge was the *Pons Mulvius* (220 B.C.), which carried the *Via Flaminia* across the Tiber, two miles N. of the city; and the *Pons Aemilius* (with the reconstructed island-bridges, thenceforth known as *Pons Fabricius* and *Pons Cestius*) completes the total of those erected under the Republic. The bridges added under the Empire were the *Pontes Agrippae*, *Neronianus*, *Aelius*, *Aurelius*, and *Theodosii*, the first two of which seem to have been of comparatively small importance, or at any rate to have had a brief existence, while whether the *Pons Probi* is the predecessor of the *Pons Theodosii*, or a name given to one of the other bridges (probably the *Pons Aemilius*) which had been restored by Probus, is quite uncertain.

The area enclosed within the 'Servian' wall was, no doubt, at first larger than was actually required for habitation (this must have been the case, indeed, in almost all the early cities of Italy); and, for some time after its erection, we hear little of the construction of public buildings, except of temples. The commercial quarters by the Tiber, on the other hand, soon spread both up and down stream, beyond the small stretch of the left bank which was enclosed by the city wall. The *Forum Boarium*, or cattle-market, had found room within the city, but the *Forum Holitorium*, or vegetable market, and the *Emporium*, grew up outside it.

43. A new epoch was opened by the censorship of Appius Claudius Caecus (312 B.C.), the constructor of the first military high road<sup>1</sup> and of the first aqueduct, the latter mainly for the benefit of the quarters by the Tiber. The second aqueduct, the *Anio Vetus*, dates from 272—269 B.C. It was followed at a long

Appius  
Claudius.

<sup>1</sup> 'The course of the *Via Latina* is more natural for such a line of way than that of the more celebrated *Via Appia*, and must have offered less difficulties before the con-

interval by the *Aqua Marcia* (144—140 B.C.); this tapped some very fine springs in the upper Anio valley, which are still in use as one of the main supplies of modern Rome; while the *Aqua Tēpūla*, which was of minor importance, dates from 125 B.C. The early years of the 2nd century B.C. were remarkable for a further increase of building activity, which was rendered possible by the successful issue of the second Punic war, and in which the censors of 179—174 B.C. were especially prominent (Livy, xl 51). The spread of Greek culture made itself felt, such words as *emporium* and *basilica* found their way into the language, and columns of foreign marble began to be used. We hear too, for the first time, of permanent buildings in the *Circus Maximus*. The city as a whole, however, seems to have grown up quite unsystematically; it had narrow and ill-built streets, and the central portion, between the hills and the river, was cramped and overcrowded, though it had already overflowed into the *Campus Martius*. Sulla in some measure relieved the pressure by enlarging the *pomerium*, and extending it (except as regards the Aventine) up to the city walls: but this by itself was insufficient.

44. Julius Caesar was the first to grapple with the problem. He realised the necessity of improving the communications between the Forum Romanum and the northern portion of the city; and Julius Caesar. the changes, which he made in the Forum, and the building of the new Forum Iulium, were directed to this end. It was in his time, also, that the bed of the Tiber was for the first time regulated and stone *dippi* erected along its banks (54 B.C.). He formed, indeed, a project of diverting its course just above the city, with a view to a considerable enlargement of the *Campus Martius*. Pompey, at the same time, erected the first important group of public buildings in the *Campus Martius*,—his theatre and the porticos connected with it.

45. Augustus continued on the same lines, completing the plans which Caesar had begun, erecting a temple in his honour at the Augustus. SE. end of the Forum, and himself adding another Forum on the NE. of that of Caesar. In other parts of the city, and especially in the *Campus Martius*, where three large groups of public buildings are due to him, his activity, partly on lines marked out by Caesar (as in the case of the *Saepta*) and partly in other directions, was most remarkable; in this activity his son-in-law, Agrippa, had a considerable share; and the emperor's boast, that he found the city of brick and left it of marble (though it seems to those who see the ruins of Rome in their present condition to be quite untrue), had its meaning at the time. In the *Monumentum Ancyranum* he states that he restored 82 temples, besides those which he built himself, the most magnificent among the latter being the temple of

struction of an artificial road' (Bunbury in Smith's *Dict. of Geogr.*, s.v. *Via Latina*). As Capua joined Rome in 340—338 B.C., and as the colony of Cales was founded in 334, we might even assume that the *Via Latina* was the first military high-road to Capua (Ashby in *Papers of the British School at Rome*, iv 4 f).

Apollo on the Palatine<sup>1</sup>. His own residence on this hill (which had been an aristocratic quarter during the last century of the Republic) is perhaps not actually preserved. To him are also due many general regulatory measures—the division of the city into fourteen regions, in which the 'Servian' wall (now definitely abandoned as a boundary) and the high roads issuing from its gates were in the main used as a basis, eight being predominantly intra-mural and five extra-mural, while the 14th lay on the right bank of the Tiber, and included the island. See the map (facing p. 35). In this connexion he established the *vigiles*, who served as police and fire brigade, and were divided into seven cohorts, *i.e.* one cohort to every two regions. The regions themselves were divided into *vici* or quarters, each under four *magistri*, in whose charge was the worship of the *Lares Compitales*. He also carried out a second delimitation of the river banks, though the regular *curatores riparum et alvei Tiberis* were not established until the time of Tiberius; under Trajan they had the additional charge of the *cloacae*. Augustus considerably increased the water-supply of Rome, constructing the *Aquae Iulia, Virgo, Alsietina*, and restoring the channels of the other aqueducts. The first public baths, the *thermae* of Agrippa, which naturally required an ample water-supply, were constructed in his time.

46. Tiberius' building activity was mainly confined to the Palatine, where he constructed a large palace on the NW. side of the hill. He also erected a permanent camp for the praetorian guard on the NE. of the city. His successor, Caligula, began great undertakings, which his early death prevented him from completing, though he built the *circus*, which became the scene of Nero's cruelties to the Christians, and is now occupied by S. Peter's. Claudius only completed the two great aqueducts, the *Aqua Claudia* and the *Anio Novus*, which had been commenced by his predecessor, restored the *Circus Maximus* (which was subject to frequent fires), and enlarged the *pomerium*, taking in the Aventine, and some ground on the left bank of the Tiber.

47. The degree of Nero's responsibility for the fire of 64 A.D. will never be known. Signor Profumo in a recent book on the subject (*Le fonti ed i tempi dell' Incendio Neroniano*, 1905, p. 477) makes the interesting observation that Nero, supposing him to have caused the fire, was calculating on the WSW. breeze, which rarely fails on a summer afternoon, but that the wind must have changed to scirocco (SE.) inasmuch as the flames ran NW. along the whole length of the circus, instead of taking an ENE. direction<sup>2</sup>. He certainly took advantage of it

\* <sup>1</sup> Identified by Pinza (*Bull. Com.*, 1910, 3 f) with the 'temple of Iupiter Victor'.

<sup>2</sup> Hülsen, however (*Amer. Journ. Arch.* 1909, 46), rightly observes that, assuming the fire was caused by Nero, he could hardly have chosen a worse time than that at which it actually occurred (the night of July 18—19). There was a full moon on the previous night, and his emissaries would have run great risk of detection. Hülsen therefore concludes that the fire had an accidental origin.



to appropriate the district between the Palatine and Esquiline for his Golden House (the site of which was ostentatiously devoted to public buildings by his successors), destroying even the temple of Claudius, which Agrippina had erected on a large platform on the N. extremity of the Caelian, in order to construct a great fountain there; the temple was however restored by Vespasian. But Nero also compelled private proprietors to reconstruct their houses in a more substantial way, and to allow greater width for the streets. He himself constructed public *thermae* in the *Campus Martius*.

48. Vespasian, the founder of a new dynasty, rebuilt much of what had suffered destruction during the tumults which preceded his accession, and, above all, the Capitolium; he also added a Vespasian. new Forum, with a temple of Peace in the centre; he erected the Colosseum on the site of a great lake in the gardens of the Golden House: and, as censor, carried out a new survey of the city; the results of this were probably recorded in an earlier form of the marble plan of Rome, which, in its present shape, dates from the time of Septimius Severus and Caracalla. On the back of some of the slabs, on which this plan is cut, portions of a plan, roughly sketched in red, with the buildings partly in elevation, have been found, and this may be attributed to Vespasian. He also enlarged the *pomerium*, taking in a large portion of the *Campus Martius*, though not all that fell within the 9th region, and its line, as determined by him, seems to have henceforth remained unchanged; Hadrian's *cippi* being mere restorations of those of Vespasian. An inscription, sawn off one of the *cippi* of the latter, was found in the church of S. Cecilia in Trastevere in 1899 (*C. I. L.* vi 31538 c), built into a mediaeval wall—a fact which does not render it necessary to suppose that Vespasian included the 14th region of Augustus within the *pomerium*. The boundary of the 14 regions coincided, on the other hand, with that of the *pomerium* on the N. and E.: the former was also the *octroi* line, and *cippi* belonging to it have been found, erected by M. Aurelius and Commodus, but along an already established boundary.

49. The short reign of Titus was marked by the completion of the Colosseum and of the *thermae* which bear his name, and by another great fire, which did considerable damage in the Titus.  
Domitian. *Campus Martius*. To the Flavian emperors, but, in the main, to Domitian, is due the central part of the imperial residence on the Palatine, which had been destroyed by the fire of 64 A.D.; he rebuilt the temple of Augustus, connecting it with the Palatine by a great series of inclined planes. He also began the erection of a new Forum, completed by his successor Nerva, the *Forum Transitorium*, Nerva. which secured better communication between the Forum Romanum and the eastern portions of the city.

50. Trajan's most important achievement in Rome was the construction of his immense Forum, which finally solved the problem of easy



communication between the centre of Rome and the *Campus Martius*. It is not easy to see why this solution had not been adopted by any of his predecessors. The discoveries of 1812-14 (described in Nibby's edition of Nardini's *Roma Antica*, ii 351, a passage which has escaped the notice of many writers) and those of 1906 have shown that, where the column of Trajan stands, and also on the site of the north-eastern hemicycle of his Forum, there had previously been other buildings at lower levels and a different orientation; and the reference of the inscription on the column, *ad declarandum quantae altitudinis mons et locus tantis operibus sit egestus*, must be, not to the original height of the hill at the point where it stands (for we can no longer believe in the existence of a ridge connecting the Capitol and the Quirinal), but to the greatest height to which the hillside was cut back (HülSEN, *Roman Forum*, 21)<sup>1</sup>. Trajan also constructed large *thermae* upon the remains of the *Domus Aurea*, and added another to the number of the aqueducts.

51. The reign of Hadrian marks another period of activity in building

(a very large proportion of the brick-stamps known to us belong to this period), and to him are due three of the most remarkable edifices of Rome—the double temple of Venus and Rome (which occupied the whole summit of the Velia), the Pantheon in its present form, and the great Mausoleum, which he built for himself with the bridge leading to it. He also considerably enlarged the imperial palace on the Palatine. The Antonine Emperors confined themselves to the construction of a group of buildings in the *Campus Martius* (of which the column of Marcus Aurelius was the most prominent feature), and to the erection of the temple of Faustina; but the fire of Commodus in 191 A.D., by which the Forum was especially affected, gave Septimius Severus an opportunity of

M. Aurelius.  
Sept. Severus.  
Caracalla.

displaying considerable magnificence in restoration. The temple and atrium of Vesta, in particular, owe their present form to his wife Julia Domna; and the *Forum Pacis* was restored by him. The marble plan of Rome, which had, very possibly, been damaged by the fire, was recut, no doubt after a new survey; and it is the fragments of this which have come down to us. It was affixed to the NE. wall of a building which commonly bears the name of *Templum Sacrae Urbis*, but which was probably a library connected with the *Forum Pacis*. New buildings were, however, also undertaken. An enormous new palace was erected at the SE. angle of the Palatine, with an ornamental façade, the *Septizonium*, intended to strike the eye of the traveller from the south; and a very lofty line of arches, four tiers one above the other, took the place of the siphon which, since

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Ashby in *Classical Quarterly*, ii (1908) 143 f. Boni's translation, 'in order to make visible' (from the summit of the column, 100 feet above the tomb of Trajan) 'how much the hill' (that is, the slope of the Quirinal) and the site (of the Forum Ulpium) 'had been raised up by such noble works of art' (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, 29 May, 1907), does not seem linguistically acceptable.

the time of Domitian, had carried the water from Nero's branch-aqueduct across the valley. Still more remarkable were Caracalla's huge *thermae* by the Via Appia, massive remains of which now stand in the recently formed *Passeggiata Archeologica*. The water supply of Rome was increased by a considerable addition to the volume of the *Aqua Marcia*. Severus Alexander constructed *thermae*, with a special aqueduct to supply them, on the site of those of Nero, but the troublous times between 235 and 284 allowed of little building activity, except for the hasty construction of the *enceinte* of Aurelian and Probus (270—282). These walls seem in the main to have followed the boundary of the regions (and the *octroi* line), though they took great advantage of existing buildings, which were indeed made use of to about one-third of the total length of the *enceinte*. In one case the work was so hastily done that the statues were not even removed from the niches of a *nymphaeum* incorporated in the wall. On the right bank the defences merely consisted of two walls ascending from the Tiber to the summit of the Janiculum. The walls are of brickwork with an internal gallery and towers at frequent intervals. The huge building at the south-west extremity of the Quirinal is by some identified with the temple of the Sun erected by Aurelian, by others with the temple of Serāpis built by Caracalla. Nothing of it is now standing, but a portion of its cornice existing in the Colonna gardens measures  $12\frac{1}{2} \times 9\frac{1}{2} \times 13$  feet and weighs 100 tons. In 283 occurred the great fire of Carinus, which affected the Forum\* especially, and gave Diocletian an opportunity for executing extensive restorations, notably that of the *Curia*. But his most important building was the colossal *thermae*, vaster even than those of Caracalla, though now less impressive, and less well preserved, as they lie in the centre of the modern city. His successor Maxentius continued the embellishment of the Forum, beginning in 306 the immense basilica, which was completed by Constantine, and generally bears the latter's name. The round *heroön* of Maxentius' son Romulus is remarkable for the skilful use of an awkward site (see *Plan of Forum*). Constantine also erected *thermae* on the Quirinal (entirely destroyed since the 16th century): but with him begins the period of the erection of the Christian Basilicas, and a survey of classical Rome need hardly be continued further, though there is in reality no solution of continuity in Rome.

52. With regard to private buildings, we have seen that, at the close of the Republican period, the Palatine was a favourite residence of the wealthy. When the Palatine was occupied by the imperial palace, the Caelian, Esquiline and Pincian came into favour, the two latter being especially remarkable for their extensive gardens. The private houses of the Quirinal and Viminal, a considerable number of which have been localised by excavation, were in large measure obliterated by the construction of the *thermae* of Diocletian and of Constantine. Other gardens, belonging however to the imperial domain,

Aurelian.

Diocletian.

Maxentius.

Constantine.

Private  
buildings.

occupied the ridge of the Janiculum. The Aventine, on the other hand, was always a plebeian quarter, owing to its vicinity to the Tiber and the commercial quarter round the *Forum Boarium*, which also extended to the low ground on the right bank. The *Campus Martius* underwent, as we have seen, a gradual change from an open plain to a succession of magnificent public buildings; while the Capitol preserved its inviolability through all periods, and was almost entirely devoted to sacred uses.

53. It may be of interest to conclude this brief sketch of the topography of ancient Rome by a short account of the main results of the latest excavations in the Forum Romanum, from December 1898 onwards.

Forum  
Romanum.

The historical importance of the discovery of the prehistoric cemetery near the temple of Antoninus and Faustina has already been mentioned (p. 36). The earliest graves are attributed by Hülsen to the 8th or 9th century B.C., while other authorities date them even earlier. In these we see that cremation was the rite observed, the ashes being enclosed in an ossuary of varying type (often a hut-urn), and this placed, with other small vases containing sacrificial gifts or remains of the funeral banquet, within a large jar. This was buried in a circular pit, and the whole covered with a slab, and small lumps, of tufa. The later graves, in which inhumation is universal, in some cases cut into the earlier tombs; but the greater portion of them contain wooden coffins enclosing the bones of children, who would perhaps have been buried even in the cremation-period. There is, in fact, but little distinction in the pottery, which is of native manufacture, closely akin to that which has been found in the early Esquiline cemeteries and in the Latin tombs of the Alban Hills. The material is the clay found on the spot, from which, indeed, Commendatore Boni succeeded in making exact duplicates of the pottery he had discovered. Only in some of the most recent graves have 'Proto-Corinthian' vases been found. A considerable quantity of bronze objects, especially *fibulae*, some ornamented with amber, occur; also glass and ivory; but nothing which can be considered later than the 6th century B.C. In the base of the equestrian statue of Domitian a group of precisely similar vases had been enclosed at the moment of its construction. It is probable that a tomb of this early period had been disturbed in making its foundations. To a slightly later period (though at least as early as the 5th century B.C.) belong the inscribed *cippus* and the earliest form of the raised platform dividing the Comitium from the Forum—a platform which included the Rostra and the legendary tomb of Romulus, and was considerably altered in subsequent periods. The inscription on the *cippus* is the earliest Latin inscription on stone which has come down to us; but scarcely one-half of it is preserved, though that which remains is remarkable for the clearness and freshness of the lettering. The interpretation is, unfortunately, uncertain, and the history of the whole group of monuments is not easy to follow

Prehistoric  
cemetery.

(*Classical Review*, 1906, 132 f). But, whatever may be the origin of the black marble pavement, which, under the later Empire (if not from the late Republican period) marked the site of the legendary tomb of Romulus<sup>1</sup>, it is to Julius Caesar that we must attribute the erection of the Curia on its present site, and the transference of the Rostra from the boundary between the Comitium and Forum to the NW. end of the latter, just below the Volcanal (where the rock-cut altar of Vulcan has been found). It seems probable, however, that what has hitherto been regarded as the Rostra of Caesar was really erected by Augustus, with the flight of stone steps, while the hemicycle in its present form may be attributed to Septimius Severus<sup>2</sup>. It was Caesar, too, who was mainly responsible for the construction of the two basilicas, the Aemilia and the Julia, which flanked the central area of the Forum, and for the delimitation of this area. In front of the Comitium, and marking its limits at the time of Faustus Sulla, are three parallel lines (running E. and W.) of the so-called 'pozzi rituali', small stone-lined pits, usually square but sometimes pentagonal; while the open area of the Forum as remodelled by Caesar is marked on three sides by a straight line of them, one in front of the Rostra, another in front of the Basilica Julia, and a third on the NW. side of the road which, until the temple of Caesar was erected, formed the SE. boundary of the Forum. Those in front of the Basilica Aemilia were destroyed when Agrippa altered the line of the *Cloaca Maxima*, making it pass round the Basilica Aemilia, instead of beneath it, and rejoin the older line at the shrine of Venus Cloacina, at the foot of the steps of the basilica. The latter was re-erected on the exact site of the earlier Republican building of 179 B.C. It was a magnificent structure, on a somewhat curious plan, differing considerably from that of the Basilica Julia, which was laid bare in 1872. The results of the investigations in the central area of the Forum are of considerable interest. They include the following discoveries:—(1) the site of the 'Lacus Curtius', with its three successive pavements ('*Curtius ille lacus, siccus qui sustinet aras, Nunc solida est tellus, sed lacus ante fuit*', Ovid, *Fasti*, vi 403); (2) an inscription in the pavement of the Forum, which may determine the site of the praetorian tribunal, and (3) the base of the equestrian statue of Domitian described by Statius (*Silvae*, I i), which must have been about six times life-size. Close to the latter an important building (not, however, the Imperial tribunal) has recently been laid bare. Another discovery of especial interest, as giving reality to classical reading, is that of the base of an altar in the niche in the façade of the temple of Caesar, resting upon the actual paving-slabs of travertine on which his body was burnt. SE. of the temple the spring of

Lapis niger.

Julius Caesar.

Recent Discoveries in central area.

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Carter, in *Amer. Journ. Arch.* xiii (1909) 19 f, considers that, in this group of monuments, we have the altar in the Comitium at which the *rex* performed certain of his functions, while the *ciippus* would be the *lex arae*. For the inscription see the chapter on *Epigraphy*, p. 732.

<sup>2</sup> See Miss E. B. van Deman in *Amer. Journ. Arch.* xiii (1909) 170 f.



Juturna has been discovered, with fragments of the statues of the Great Twin Brethren. Near this is the shrine of Juturna, which faces north, thus preserving (like the temple of Vesta and the stairway descending from the Palatine at this point) an orientation which follows the points of the compass. To the SW. was found a remarkable group of buildings due to Domitian (as is proved by the brick-stamps), and forming one whole with the temple of Augustus, which had already been excavated. They include a large hall sacred to Minerva, which served as the military archives (the military diplomas found in the provinces always record, from about 89 A.D. onwards, that the original was preserved in Rome *post templum Divi Augusti ad Mineruam*). They also include a courtyard with colonnades (probably the chief room of the library attached to the temple), and, lastly, a splendid series of inclined planes leading up to the Palatine. These two halls were, in the 6th century A.D., or even earlier, converted into the church of S. Maria Antiqua, and contain paintings of the 7th and 8th centuries of remarkable interest. They are built upon the site of a very large *impluvium* ( $29\frac{1}{2} \times 82$  feet), which probably belonged to the palace of Tiberius. (Cp. Rushforth, *Papers of the British School at Rome*, I, 1, and W. von Grüneisen, *S. Mariae Antiquae*, Rome, 1911.)

The excavations have extended as far as the Arch of Titus, having passed beyond the limits of the Forum along the *Sacra Via* (which, according to the original conception, ran from the house of the *rex sacrificulus*, near the Arch of Titus, to the *Regia*). They have brought considerable additions to our knowledge in details with regard to the *Regia* and the *Aedes* and *Atrium Vestae*, and further remains of the earlier *Atrium* of the Republic have been found. Considerable remains have been found of the road of the 1st century A.D., and of the buildings which flanked it. It ascended the ridge of the Velia somewhat steeply, and crossed it a little to the north of the present position of the Arch of Titus, having a branch leading up to the Palatine, and also called *clivus sacer*, upon the pavement of which the Arch stands. Opposite to the Basilica of Constantine some massive concrete foundations have been discovered, which are attributed with some probability to the reign of Nero. At the time when they were laid, the level must have been raised, and the *Sacra Via*, instead of ascending in a slight curve, may have henceforth run straight, while the erection of the Temple of Venus and Rome forced it to turn twice at right angles, and to pass through the Arch of Titus. Certain remains discovered below the Arch possibly belong to the Republican temple of Jupiter Stator.

54. Investigations begun in 1907 at the W. angle of the Palatine, near the temple of Cybele, have led to the discovery of remains of several periods, the meaning of which is not yet certain. The earliest pottery, there found, dates from the 8th century B.C. (It was at first supposed that fragments of Villanova ossuaries had been discovered, a supposition held by Pigorini to

Palatine  
Excavations  
of 1907-12.



be erroneous.) There is nothing of definitely sepulchral character, except an inhumation tomb of the 4th century B.C. A round open cistern, perhaps of the 6th century B.C., was found, and two subsequent periods of walling can be distinguished; but further excavation is necessary before any clear idea of these remains can be formed (cp. T. Ashby, in *Classical Quarterly*, ii (1908) 146). Excavations in the Flavian palace revealed in Jan. 1912 a large open water-tank, and an earlier cistern under the so-called Basilica.

All the works cited below contain adequate references to further sources of information, especially to the official reports in the *Notizie degli Scavi* and *Bullettino Comunale*, while the *Nomenclator Topographicus* annexed to H. Kiepert and Ch. Hülsen's *Formae Urbis Romae Antiquae*<sup>2</sup> contains an alphabetical bibliography up to 1911. H. Jordan, *Topographie der Stadt Rom*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1871—1907 (vol. I part iii by Hülsen); R. Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, London, 1897; O. Richter, *Topographie der Stadt Rom*, ed. 2, Munich, 1901; S. B. Platner, *Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*, Boston, U.S.A. 1911<sup>2</sup>; G. Pinza, *Monumenti Primitivi di Roma e del Lazio Antico*, in *Monumenti dei Lincei*, xv, 1905; Ch. Hülsen, *The Roman Forum*, Rome, 1909<sup>2</sup>; T. Ashby, 'Recent Excavations in Rome', in *Classical Review* and *The Year's Work*. The want of a proper bibliography of the immense mass of printed literature on the subject, which begins with the first edition of Flavio Biondo's *Roma Instaurata* in 1474, and of the mediaeval and Renaissance drawings and MSS relating to Rome, which are scattered up and down the libraries of Europe, and of the numerous topographical engravings (many of them of great variety) is in some measure supplied by R. Lanciani, *Storia degli Scavi di Roma*, Rome (i—iii, 1902—8; in progress), in which a large number of documents of topographical interest are also published for the first time. For the mediaeval descriptions of Rome see C. L. Urlichs, *Codex Urbis Romae Topographicus*, Würzburg, 1871, and Jordan, *op. cit.* vol. II; and for the mediaeval plans, G. B. de Rossi, *Piante iconografiche e prospettiche di Roma anteriori al secolo xvi*, Rome, 1879, and Hülsen in *Bullettino Comunale*, 1892, 38. For the mediaeval collections of inscriptions, see E. Ziebarth, *De antiquissimis inscriptionum syllogis*, in *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, ix 187 f. Some of the important Renaissance sketch-books have already been published in their entirety, cf. especially S. Reinach, *L'album de Pierre Jacques*, Paris, 1902; T. Ashby, *Sixteenth Century Drawings of Roman Buildings attributed to Andreas Coner* (*Papers of the British School at Rome*, vol. II), London, 1904; H. Egger, *Codex Escorialensis* (*Sonderschriften des österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts in Wien*, Band IV, Vienna, 1905); Ch. Hülsen, *Il Libro di Giuliano da Sangallo*, Leipzig, 1911. See also N. Ferri, *Catalogo dei Disegni di Architettura esistenti nella R. Galleria degli Uffizi in Firenze*, Rome, 1885. The best plan of Ancient Rome is R. Lanciani, *Forma Urbis Romae*, Rome, 1893—1901, on the scale of 1 : 1000; the smaller plans of Kiepert and Hülsen (*op. cit.*) will also be found serviceable. The inscriptions are published in the *Corpus Inscr. Lat.* vol. vi, and the *Instrumentum Domesticum* (inscriptions on lead pipes, stamps on bricks &c.) in vol. xv.

See also bibliographies in *Am. Journ. Arch.*, and (by Hülsen) in *Geographisches Jahrbuch*, 1911, 189—218.

## II. FAUNA AND FLORA.

### II. 1. FAUNA.

#### A. MAMMALS.

55. *Simiae*. In historic times there were no apes in Europe. Even on the 'ape-island' of Ischia (Πιθηκούσσα) apes had ceased to exist; but they were frequently imported from Africa, and were trained to perform various amusing tricks. (1) The Barbary ape, *Inuus ecaudatus*, now found at Gibraltar, was the best known species. (2) There was also a domesticated variety of long-tailed monkey (*cercopithecus*); 'callidus emissas eludere simius hastas, | si mihi cauda foret *cercopithecus* eram', Mart. (3) The dog-faced baboon (*cynocēphālus*), *Cynocephalus hamadryas*, became familiar in Italy owing to the introduction of Egyptian cults.

The bat (*vespertilio*), *Vesperugo pipistrellus*, and *Vesperugo murinus*, was known as the only flying creature that was viviparous and gave suck to its young, and also as the only one that had leathery wings. It was superstitiously believed to possess prophylactic properties.

The hedgehog (*ēr* or *ērīnācēus*), *Erinaceus europaeus*, was common, and its bristly hide, used in the manufacture of cloth, was an important article of commerce. The shrew-mouse (*mus ārīnēus* or *caccus*, *sōrex* or *saurex*) was represented in Italy by three species. (1) the common shrew-mouse, *Sorex vulgaris*, (2) *Crocidura araneus*, and (3) *C. suaveolus*; but these were not distinguished from one another. Their bite was supposed to be fatal, and their squeak was often regarded as a sufficient reason for interrupting the auspices. The mole (*talpa*), *Talpa caeca*, is not our common mole, but the 'blind mole' of Southern Europe. Traps as well as weasels (and, in later times, cats) were employed to capture it for the sake of its glossy skin, and also because it was deemed to be destructive to vegetation.

56. The bear (*ursus*), *Ursus arctos*, was often found in Italy down to the time of Augustus, but in the imperial age its frequent use in the contests of the Amphitheatre naturally led to its becoming scarce at an early date. Captured specimens were skilfully

trained; they even went through a mimic performance in the 'Roman games' given by the Emperor Carinus (284 A.D.). There were white bears in Thrace and Mysia, probably identical with the Syrian bear, *U. Syriacus*, now found in Armenia. The polar bear, *U. maritimus*, was unknown to the ancients.

The badger (*maeles* or *meles*), *M. taxus*, is seldom mentioned. Its skin was used for hunters' caps and for dogs' collars. The name *fēles* or *fēlis* (etymologically connected with *fel*, 'gall') was applied, first, to the yellow-breasted pine-marten, *Martes vulgaris* or *Mustela martes*, and next, to the white-breasted stone-marten, *Martes foina*. Smaller than these is the weasel (*mustēla*), *Foetorius* (or *Mustela*) *vulgaris*, which was kept in the houses to catch mice. The pole-cat, or wild ferret, *Foetorius furo*, was imported into Spain from Africa, to hunt rabbits. Strabo (144) tells us that it was muzzled for this purpose. It is called *uiuerra* in Pliny, and *furo* in Isidore.

The soft fur of the otter (*lutra*), *Lutra vulgaris*, was highly valued. The dogs that were most prized were those of the Laconian and Molossian breeds, the former resembling our hounds, the latter our mastiffs. Besides these there was the large woolly 'Spitz', or Pomeranian wolf-dog, which is figured on Etruscan coins (Imhoof-Blumer u. Keller, i 45). Far more famous, however, was the diminutive white 'Melitaean' lap-dog (Plin. iii 152), another kind of 'Spitz', which cannot, however, be identified with the 'Bologna dog', for the latter is a kind of poodle, and poodles and terriers were unknown in ancient Italy. Besides the Laconian hounds, which were bred by the emperors, two species were introduced in late imperial times, the Gallic greyhound (*uertrāgus*, Mart.), and the small Scotch mastiff (*canis Scoticus*), which was imported in iron cages, and formed a special attraction when let loose against wild beasts in the Circus (Symmachus, *Epist.* ii 77). Hounds and watch-dogs are distinguished by Varro (ii 9, 2), while black watch-dogs and white sheep-dogs are mentioned by Columella. Large greyhounds of a fine type may be seen on the coins of Sicilian towns, such as Panormus, Motya, Segesta, Eryx (Imhoof-Blumer u. Keller, i 37-40), as well as a strong and spirited variety of dog with a bushy tail, probably representing the famous watch-dogs kept in the temple of Adrānos, near mount Aetna (Daremberg-Saglio, s. v. *Canis*, fig. 1114). The large Greek hound, bred in Crete, came from Africa; while the Molossian hounds were, partially at least, of Asiatic origin. The wolf, *Canis lupus*, sacred to Mars, was the most prominent beast of prey in the old classical world. While it was unknown in Corsica and Sardinia, it was common in Italy and Sicily, and still more so in Spain, Gaul and Germany. Of all the denizens of the woodland there is none that is oftener mentioned by the Roman poets. It invaded the Italian towns and even Rome itself. It carried off sheep, goats, cattle, hogs, asses, horses and deer. It often appeared in flocks numbering (it is said) as many as 500. A belief in were-wolves (*uersipelles*) is found as early as the time of Plautus, and there is an interesting were-wolf story in Petronius (c. 62). The fox, *Canis vulpes*, plays a frequent part in proverbs and

fables, where it takes the place originally filled by the Indian jackal. It was hunted down as the foe of poultry; its flesh was not eaten in Rome. The jackal, *Canis aureus*, was regarded as a foreign animal by the Romans, who knew it only under its Greek name, *θώς*. The Egyptian ichneumon, *Herpestes ichneumon*, was the theme of all kinds of fabulous stories, especially in connexion with its conflicts with crocodiles and asps. The two species of hyaena, the striped, *H. striata*, and the spotted, *H. crocuta*, were known to the Romans, but the latter was the rarer of the two, and has become extinct in North Africa. As weird wild beasts in the habit of digging up graves, both kinds were enveloped in a tissue of superstitious legends, which find credence even with intelligent writers, such as Columella. The lion, *Felis leo*, was first known to the Romans during the Punic Wars, and the noble beast was slain in enormous numbers during the Games of the Circus and the Amphitheatre. Most of these lions were imported from Africa, especially from Mauretania and Gaetulia. Black lions were reputed to be found in Libya, and gigantic lions with black manes in India. The first *uenatio* with lions and panthers was given by M. Fulvius Nobilior in 186 B.C. The tiger, *Felis tigris*, was always a great rarity in Rome. The first tame tiger was exhibited by Augustus at the dedication of the theatre of Marcellus, 13 B.C. The epithet *uirgatus* is applied to the tiger by Seneca (*Phaëdra* 352, *Herc. Oet.* 146; cp. Silius v 148, 'uirgato corpore tigris'); and the swiftness of its spring is duly noticed. Among the wild beasts not indigenous to Europe, the leopard (*panthēra, pardus*), *Felis pardus*, was most frequently used for the *uenatio*. Augustus, according to his own statement in the 'Monumentum Ancyranum', exhibited as many as 3500. They were captured in large numbers in Africa and in Asia Minor. Caelius urges Cicero to send him leopards from Cilicia for the games in Rome (*ad Fam.* viii 9, 3). The term *Africanæ* (sc. *bestiæ*), often applied to leopards, probably included other animals of cognate kinds, e.g. the cheetah, *Felis jubata*. The lynx (*lynx, chama, lupus ceruarius*, Plin.), *Felis lynx*, a native of Gaul (Plin.) or Scythia (Hyginus), was hardly known to the Romans. It was reputed to excel all animals in keenness of sight. It was only at the celebrated games of Pompey in 55 B.C., that real lynxes were exhibited (Plin. viii 70). The same name was, however, given to several animals, viz. (1) the northern lynx, or *chama*, called *rufius* by the Gauls; (2) the Spanish lynx (also found in Africa), *F. pardina*, 'a small reddish kind, which hunts hares' (according to Timotheus); (3) the caracal, *F. caracal*, a native of Africa and S. W. Asia; (4) the Egyptian wild-cat, *F. chaus* (also found in S. W. Asia); and (5) the wild-cat, *F. catus ferus*, not unfrequently found in the forests of Southern Europe, and known as *feles* down to the end of the fourth century, and as *gattoferus* in very late Latin, though seldom mentioned in literature. Our household cat, *F. maniculata*, was tamed by the ancient Egyptians; the name *cattus* is first found in Palladius (cent. iv A.D.); it was then used for capturing moles. For catching mice, the Romans made use of weasels or tame snakes.



There are some indications, however, that, even in the classical age, attempts were made to domesticate the Egyptian cat in Italy. A fine mosaic found at Pompeii clearly represents some species of 'cat', which, however, has a closer resemblance to the Egyptian wild-cat than to the *Felis maniculata*. It is in the act of tearing in pieces a mountain-partridge, *Perdix saxatilis* (Gargiulo, *Mus. Nat.* fig. 136). Again, Pliny twice refers to our common cat, under the name of *feles*, as an animal that was perfectly well known (esp. x 202). In Pliny, as in Cicero (*N. D.* i 101), we find the name *feles* (derived from its yellow hue, and originally applied to animals with yellow breasts, such as the pine-marten and the wild cat), extended in meaning so as to include the Egyptian cat (cp. Mayor on *Juv.* xv 7)<sup>1</sup>. The seal (*phoca*) was known in Latin as the sea-calf, *vitulus marinus*. The name refers mainly to the Monk (or Mediterranean) seal, *Phoca monachus*, which is still common in the Adriatic and in the Levant. Pliny particularly notices that it could easily be trained (viii 41). The other species, *Ph. vitulina*, is also found in the Mediterranean.

57. The rodents include the squirrel (*sciūrus*, lit. 'shadow-tail'), which was sometimes tamed and kept as a household pet (Mart.).

Rodentia.

The ancients were familiar with the hibernating habits of the marmot (*mus Alpinus*, Plin.); the 'fat dormouse' (*glis*), *Myoxus glis*; and another species of dormouse (*nītēla*, *nītēdūla*, *nītella*), *Eliomys quercinus*. The last two, which were regarded as great delicacies, were fed and fattened on farms in places called *gliraria*.

The true dormouse, *Myoxus avellanarius* L., and the hamster or 'German marmot', *Cricetus frumentarius*, were unknown in Rome. The field-mouse, *Mus silvestris*, was called *mus rusticus*, to distinguish it from the indoor mouse. In Italy and Spain, field-mice not infrequently became a serious plague, and measures were taken to exterminate them by means of weasels and snakes, poisons and mouse-traps (*muscipūla*). The shrew-mouse was often confounded with the ordinary mouse, and, in colloquial Latin, the ordinary synonym for *mus* was *sōrex*, whence the French *souris*. The beaver (*fiber*, Plin.), *Castor fiber*, once common in Italy, became very rare as civilisation advanced. The soft and silky fur was used for the manufacture of *vestes castōrinae* (Isid.), which are mentioned together with robes of silk. *Castōrēum*, a highly odorous secretion of the beaver, was a famous drug. The porcupine (*hystrix*), *Hystrix cristata*, was not found in Italy, being probably a native of Africa and India (Plin.). It was commonly believed that it could shoot forth its quills like arrows. The Syrian and Indian porcupine is now known as *H. hirsutirostris*. The common hare (*lēpūs*), *Lepus timidus*, pervaded a large part of the Roman world. It was kept in preserves, and was often hunted. Roast hare, especially roast shoulder of hare (*lēpōrum armī*, Hor.), was regarded as a great delicacy, and was even

<sup>1</sup> Cp. also Otto Keller, *Zur Geschichte der Katze im Altertum*, in *Röm. Mitteilungen*, xxiii (1908) 40—70, with 12 illustrations.



believed to enhance personal charms (Plin.). The Alpine hare, *L. variabilis*, and the rabbit (*cuniculus*) were also well known. There were large numbers of rabbits in the South of France, and in Spain; in the Balearic islands they became a serious plague in the time of Augustus.

58. Of the ruminants, the camel (*camelus*) was often seen in Rome.

Ruminantia.

The Arabian camel, with a single hump, was distinguished from the Bactrian, with two. The reindeer (*tarandrus*, Plin.) was the theme of the strangest stories. Caesar, following a Greek authority, describes a stag-like species of cattle in Germany, with a large single horn in the middle of the forehead, etc. (*B. G.* vi 26). It was obviously not a native of the parts of Germany known to the Romans; though the Germans were familiar with reindeer skins as an article of trade (*rēnōnes*, *ib.* 21). The reindeer is described by Greek writers as indigenous among the Scythians, Sarmatians, and Geloni. The elk (*alces*) was better known to the Romans. The descriptions in Caesar and Pliny make it easy to identify. According to Pausanias, its *habitat* was the land of the Celts in Upper Germany. Live elks were brought to Rome in the times of Gordian (238) and Aurelian (270-5). The fallow-deer, *Cervus platycerōs* (Plin.) or *C. palmatus*, with antlers shaped like the palm of the hand (Capitolinus), was introduced into the Roman parks in imperial times, though the date is uncertain. Its meat was eaten at dinner. Its modern scientific name is *Cervus dama*, but it is not to be confounded with the classical *damma* (not *dama*), which is generally the antelope, and sometimes the chamois or wild goat (see below). The red deer, *Cervus elaphus*, was far more frequently kept in parks than the fallow-deer. It was also found wild in Italy and in the other lands of western and central Europe; hunting the red deer was a favourite kind of sport, and roast venison was held in high esteem. The fawn was called *inūlēus*, Hor., Prop. (connected with *ἰνελος*). In Africa there was a peculiar species of deer, now known as the 'Barbary deer'. The roebuck, *Cervus capreolus*, was kept partly for pleasure, partly for sale; the doe was called *caprea*. The giraffe (*camelopardalis*) was often exhibited in Rome, in and after the dictatorship of Caesar. It is mentioned by Horace, and described with some accuracy by Pliny. Among the various species of African antelopes, mentioned by Columella, Pliny and Aelian, are the *oryx*, *catoblepas*, *strepsicērōs* (or *addax*), and *dorcās*. The horns of the *oryx*, *Oryx leucoryx*, are long and curved, shaped like a sabre; those of the *strepsicēros* are twisted. The *catoblepas*, found among the negroes, is the gnu; while *dorcās* is the gazelle, *Antelope dorcās*. *Damma* (not *dama*) denotes an antelope with horns curled towards the front like those of a chamois; it is sometimes used to denote our chamois, which was also named *rupicapra* (Plin.). Goats (*capellae*), wild or tame. In Italy tame goats were kept in herds of 50 to 100 (Varro) those without horns being preferred, because they did less damage and produced more milk. Cheese made from goats' milk was a favourite article of diet. The long-horned Angora-goat, bred in Asia

Minor, supplied a fine silky hair for *cilicium* (used in making tents and socks), and for different kinds of cloth, as well as for Persian carpets. The wild-goat or 'bezoar-goat', *Capra aegagrus*, was found among the mountains of central Italy, especially on Soracte, and in the range of Fiscellus and on Tetrica in Samnium (Varr. *R. R.* ii 1, 5). The ibex, *Capra ibex*, belonged to the Alps; it was not exhibited in the Roman games until near the end of the imperial age. The moufflon (*musmo* or *musimo*, *δφιων*), *Ovis musmo*, was known to the Romans. Its *habitat* was Corsica and Spain; at the present day it is also found in Sardinia, Cyprus and N. Africa. The wild sheep, *Aegoceros argali*, lived in herds in Phrygia. There were sheep of the finest breed in Apulia, especially at Luceria and Tarentum. Their fleece was covered with felt to keep it perfectly clean. Fine wool was also imported from Spain. The Italian cattle were different from those of the Alps: some of the best breed were produced in S. Italy. The Alpine cattle were small, but they gave the most milk. Hornless cattle were found in Mysia; cattle with humped backs in Syria, Caria and Cyprus. Wild oxen existed in the primaeval forests of Europe and in India. India was also the home of a small species of ox called the yak, with its bushy mane, its long pendent silky hair, and its fine tail; and also of the Arni-buffalo, with its long and thick horns of enormous size. The Hercynian forest in Germany and the Paeonian region of Thrace were the favourite retreats of the bison (*bison*) with its short horns and its handsome mane, and also of the aurochs (*ürus*) with its powerful horns. The buffalo (*būbālus*) is repeatedly mentioned by Pliny and later writers as an animal which did not belong to Italy; the earliest precise account of the importation of our Asiatic buffalo belongs to about 400 A.D. The name *bubalus* is also given to a species of antelope, probably *Bubalis bo-elaphus*.

59. Elephants were first seen by the Romans in Lucania during the war against Pyrrhus; it was for this reason that they were contemptuously called 'Lucanian oxen', *boues Lucae*. They Pachydermata. were first exhibited in the Circus in 99 B.C. The African elephant, *Elephas africanus*, was mainly imported from Mauretania, but the Indian species *E. indicus* (of which the Romans had their earliest experience in the war against Pyrrhus), was reputed to be larger and stronger. A white elephant, *elephas albus*, is mentioned by Horace as a special attraction in Rome. The hippopotamus, *Hippopotamus amphibius*, was occasionally exhibited in the Circus, but was always regarded as a great rarity. The hog, *Sus scrōfa*, was highly prized among the Romans for its meat and for its fat; sucking pigs were specially esteemed; but the choicest delicacy was the *uulua*. Hams (*pernae*) were also in great request; many of the finest were imported from Gaul. Of the domesticated pigs there were two breeds, the smooth-skinned, *glabrae*, and the hairy kind, *densae*. By careful feeding, specimens of enormous size were produced, especially in Gaul and Spain. The wild boar was not rare in Italy; it was found in Umbria and Lucania, and among the Marsi. It was the ordinary *pièce de résistance* of a

great Roman banquet. In early times the choicest part of the loin (*lumbus aprunus*) was held in high esteem. At the end of the Republic it became the fashion to serve the boar whole. The boar-hunt, associated with the heroes of ancient legend, was a favourite form of sport with the emperors of Rome. Lucullus and many other wealthy Romans kept wild boars in their preserves. Both kinds of rhinoceros, the single-horned from India, and the double-horned from Africa, were known to the Romans. The former was occasionally exhibited in the games of the Circus. The latter is described by Pausanias as the 'Ethiopian ox'. The horse, *Equus caballus*, was found in a wild state in Spain, and 'in the North' (Plin.). There is evidence for the horses of Asia Minor in Assyrian reliefs, and in the pseudo-Aristotelian *mirabiles auscultationes*. Among the best breeds in the West were the Numidian, the Spanish, and the Apulian. A region of Apulia gave its name to the *Satureiani*; and the graceful Spanish amblers of Asturia were known as *Asturcōnes*. The Spanish race-horses proved swifter in the Circus than the horses from Parthia and Armenia. For use in light vehicles the favourite steeds were the spirited ponies imported from Gaul under the Celtic name of *manni*, known in colloquial Latin as *būrīci*, whence the French *bourrique*. *Mulus* (like the Greek ἡμίονος) denotes, not only the offspring of the ass and the mare, *Equus mulus*, but also that of the horse and the she-ass. The latter (which was more correctly called *hinus*) was smaller, besides being sluggish and hard to manage. The finest asses were bred from the wild-ass and the she-ass. The best kinds of the pure-bred ass, *Equus asinus*, came from Reate in the Sabine region. The wild-ass, *Asinus hemippus*, was found in Phrygia and Lycaonia. The zebra, *hippótygis*, was occasionally seen in Rome either in the theatre, or in festal processions, drawing a chariot. There was a general belief in the existence of the unicorn (*monōcērōs*), which was deemed to be the swiftest and the most dangerous of all beasts. Its Indian name, *kartazonon*, probably means 'swift ass'. The story of the 'single horn two ells in length' (Plin. viii 7, 6), probably arose from a profile view of some kind of antelope, or from the actual single horn of the Asiatic rhinoceros. The statement that cups were made out of the horn, and that any poison poured into those cups could be drunk with impunity, is intended to refer to the Indian rhinoceros. Thus a belief in the existence of the unicorn appears to have arisen from some confusion between the rhinoceros, the antelope, and the wild-ass.

60. Of the marine mammalia, the sperm-whale (*physētēr*), *Physeter*  
 Cetacea. *macrocephalus*, was produced in the Atlantic (or 'Gallic')  
 ocean. One of these whales was once stranded on the shore  
 of Gades. In the Indian ocean there were *ballaenae*, or 'whale-bone  
 whales', of still larger size, some of them as long as 400 feet (Plin.).  
 The most formidable foe of the whale was the grampus (*orca*), *Delphinus*  
*orca*, which gathered in great shoals and rent the whale in pieces. By  
 the dolphin, which is often mentioned in Latin writers, is usually meant

the *Delphinus delphis*. It was generally regarded as a kind of fish, but ancient zoologists were aware that it was intermediate between the fishes and the mammalia. The porpoise (*tursio*), *Delphinus phocaena*, which was smaller than the dolphin, is also mentioned by Pliny. The stories of Pliny and others about marine animals, with the heads of cattle or of men or satyrs, which went on land at night on the shores of India and Ceylon and fed on plants, doubtless refer to the herbivorous mammal called the dugong, *Halicore dugong*.

## B. BIRDS.

61. Among raptorial birds, the *Vulturidae* include several different species of vulture, which were not distinguished from one another by the Romans. These species include the grey *Accipitres*. vulture, *Vultur cinereus*, the griffon, *V. fulvus*, and the Egyptian vulture, *V. percnopterus*. This last may be seen on a Pompeian wall-painting, among other Egyptian animals. Vultures were common in Italy, and especially in the neighbourhood of Rome. They were regarded with reverence as augural birds. The *lämmergeier* (Aristotle's φήνη), *Gypaëtos barbatus*, is once called *aquila barbata* by Pliny, the usual name being *ossifrāga* or *ossifragus*.

*Falconidae*. Aristotle is followed by Pliny in his enumeration of six species of eagle:—(1) *melanāëtos*, either the adult golden eagle or the imperial eagle; (2) *phygargos*, the white-tailed sea-eagle, or erne (Turner); (3) *haliāëtos*, the osprey or fishing eagle; (4) *percnopterus*; (5) *gnēsios*; (6) *morphnos* or *percnos*. This last is not an eagle at all, but is our bald buzzard. Of hawks (*accipitres*), says Pliny, there are sixteen species, among them the *būteo* or *triorches*, *Falco buteo*, the buzzard; *miluus* or *ικτίνος*, *F. milvus*, the 'red kite', the most beautiful in its manner of flight; *F. tinnunculus*, the kestrel (a harmless bird, held sacred in Egypt); *F. palumbarius*, the goshawk; *F. peregrinus*, the passenger-falcon (sacred in Egypt); *F. cenchris*, the red falcon. In ancient times falconry was practised in India only.

*Striges*. Any species of owl that is smaller than the eagle owl (*būbo*, βῡας, βοῡας) is called *noctua* (γλαῦξ); especially the 'little-owl', the bird sacred to Athena. Among these smaller owls are the *strix* and the *ōtus* or 'long-eared owl'. *Ūlula* is a general term.

62. At the present day there are more than one hundred species of singing-birds in Italy. Among these may be mentioned the *turdus* (κίχλη), a term applied to all the European thrushes, especially the field-fare, *Turdus pilaris*, which was fattened on pounded figs, and was considered a very choice delicacy. *Carduēlis* is the goldfinch, *Fringilla carduelis*. The identification of *fringilla* with the chaffinch, and of the vague term *ficūdula* with the equally vague *beccafico*, is uncertain. The name *fringilla* was also given to several other small song-birds. *Passer* a general term (like its Spanish derivative, *pajaro*), is usually the 'house-sparrow', *Passer domesticus*, but is also applied to several nearly



allied species. Thus the *passer* of Catullus is doubtless the blue thrush which can be completely tamed; it is the Italian *passere solitario*, the 'sparrow that sitteth alone upon the house-top'. Even the nightingale (*luscīnia*) could be trained to talk (Plin. x 120). The swallow (*hīrundo*) was recognised as the harbinger of spring. Pliny (x 92-5) distinguishes three species, corresponding to our swallow, house-martin, and sand-martin. The swift and the Alpine swift, with very short legs, were called *āpodes*, or *cypseli* (Plin.). The crested lark (*cassīta*, Gell., lit. 'helmeted'), *Alauda cristata*, which was very common, played an important part in Roman fables from the very earliest times. The starling (*sturmus*), *Sturnus vulgaris*, was taught to speak, and the same is true of the raven (*coruus*), *Corvus corax*. The term *cornix*, crow, includes *Corvus cornix*, the hooded crow; *C. frugilegus*, the rook; and *C. corone*, the carrion-crow. [The mysterious *avis incendiaria* of Pliny (x 26), which was said to carry burning coals from the altar, is probably the eagle owl.] *Mōnēdūla*, *C. monedula*, the jackdaw, pilfers articles of gold or silver; *grācūlus* is the name for a kind of jay, (probably the *coruus glandarius* of Pliny, the parti-coloured jay, *Garrulus glandarius*, which possibly suggested Aesop's fable of the 'crow' with the stolen feathers.)—represented in a mural painting in the *Casa dell' Orso* at Pompeii. The magpie (*pīca*), *Corvus pīca*, was even cleverer than the raven in learning to talk and to imitate notes of music (Plin. x 118).

63. The climbing birds include the wryneck, *Iynx torquilla*, the *īynx* of

Picariae.

Pliny and the *frutilla* of vulgar Latin (Gloss. Philox.),—a bird used in magic rites. Among woodpeckers (*pīci*) was reckoned the nut-hatch (*Sitta europaea*). Of the different species, the most prominent is the fine, great, red-headed, black woodpecker, *Picus martius*, Pliny's 'picus cognomine Martius', regarded as sacred to Mars. According to the legend, it was into this bird that king Picus of Latium was transformed. It held the highest rank among prophetic birds (Plin. x 40). The goat-sucker (*caprimulgus*), *C. europaeus*, is incorrectly described by Pliny. The beautiful blue roller-bird, *Coracias garrula*, has not yet been identified with any of the birds mentioned by Latin writers. There were two kinds of kingfisher (*halcyōn*, *alcedo*, *κρηῖλος*). The larger kind is the pied kingfisher, *Alcedo rudis* (the *alcyonium*, which was supposed to be its nest, is really a kind of sea-sponge). The hoopoe (*ūpupa*), *Upupa epops*, is, on the whole, correctly described by Pliny (x 86). On the other hand, the cuckoo (*cūcūlus*), *C. canorus*, was wrongly believed to be the young of some bird of prey, a superstition recorded by Aristotle (*Hist. An.* vi 41) and probably due to its close resemblance to a young sparrow-hawk. The Romans prized its meat as a delicacy. They were aware of its habit of laying its eggs in the nests of other birds.

The Indian parrot (*psittācus*), *Palaeornis Alexandri*, could easily be taught to talk, and was a great favourite in Rome. Ovid

Psittaci.

(*Am.* ii 6) and Statius (*Silu.* ii 4) have poems on the death of a pet parrot.



64. The breeding of pigeons attained its highest point in the Augustan age. The birds were kept and fed in a large *columbarium* (Plato's *περιστερεών*). A pair of pigeons of a good breed was once sold for 4000 sesterces (£40), Col. Columbae. In the Roman provinces of Egypt there was a regular post of carrier-pigeons, while in Italy they were only exceptionally used, as by Hirtius at the siege of Mutina (Plin. x 110). The various species were (1) the common house-pigeon, *columba*, usually white; (2) the rock-dove, *c. saxatilis* (Varro), which is not white, and is smaller, and lives in towers; (3) the ring-dove, *pālumbes*, *pālumbus*, *pālumba*, which was captured and fattened for the table; (4) the turtle-dove, *turtur*, the smallest of them all, and easiest to fatten; and (5) the Egyptian carrier-pigeon, *c. tabellaria* (Plin.), of a blackish or dark-grey blue.

65. The barn-door fowl (*gallina*) was bred everywhere for the sake of its eggs; and, when fattened, it was a favourite article of food. Gallinae. Cock-fights were in great vogue. The dwarf fighting-cocks known as *Hadriani* were particularly pugnacious. These were almost certainly our modern 'bantams', originally imported from the distant East. There were also two varieties of the famous fighting-cocks of Tanagra. The breeding of peacocks (*pāuo*) was widely prevalent on Roman estates, and was most successfully carried out on small wooded islands. They were found wild on the island of Planasia, near Elba. Young peacocks roasted were a favourite dish. The breeding and fattening of the pheasant, *Phasianus Colchicus*, were very prevalent. In the time of Claudius, a golden pheasant was exhibited in Rome as a 'phoenix'. The Guinea-fowl (*mēlēagris*), a rare bird fetching a high price, was regarded as a delicacy, in spite of the unpleasant after-taste noticed by Pliny. It is the *Afra auis* of Horace, and is to be identified with the *Numida ptilorhyncha* of N.W. Africa, found wild near Carthage. The partridge (*perdix*) commonly mentioned is not the Northern grey partridge, *Perdix cinerea*, but the 'red-legged rock-partridge', *Caccabis saxatilis*. The *attagen* *Ionicus* is not the hazel-hen or heath-cock, but the common francolin, *Francolinus vulgaris*, the 'black partridge' of Indian sportsmen, which is now extinct in Europe. The *perdix rustica* of Martial may be the Spanish and French red-legged partridge, *Caccabis rubra*. The ptarmigan of Northern Europe (*lāgōis* or *lāgōpus*), *Lagopus mutus*, was imported by the Romans as a special delicacy. The quail (*coturnix*), as well as the rock-partridge, was used as a fighting bird (Plin. xi 268). Fattened quails were a favourite article of food. The wild quail was, however, regarded as unwholesome, but it was an important article of diet among the poorer classes. Large flocks of these birds, in the course of their migrations, settled for a time on the islands of Pontia, Palmaria, and Pandataria. The black grouse and the capercaillie were confounded under the common name of *tetrao*. When kept in aviaries, they lost their fine flavour.

66. The African ostrich (*strūthōcāmēlus* or *strūtio*) was sometimes to be seen in the Roman amphitheatre. Three hundred from Mauretania

were thus exhibited under the emperor Philippus. Ostrich-eggs were used as cups, and ostrich-feathers as an adornment of helmets. *Grallatores.* Stewed ostrich-wings were considered good to eat, and receipts for this dish are to be found in ancient cookery-books. The Spanish name for the bustard (*ōtis*) was *tarda*; Pliny could find no taste in its meat, but this opinion was not shared by later experts, such as Anthimus and Synesius. The crane (*grus*), *G. communis*, was a bird of passage (*advena*, Hor.). Flocks of cranes assumed in flight the shape of the letter V (Cic. *N.D.* ii 125). They arrived in large numbers, and were captured and fattened, and eaten roasted. There was a wide-spread belief in their battles with the Pygmies, who are now identified with the *Akka* of central Africa. The heron (*ardōla*), according to Aristōtle and Pliny, was represented by several species:—*pellos*, the grey heron; *leucos*, the lesser white heron or egret; and *asterias* (*Ardea stellaris*, the bittern). The spoon-bill (*plātālā*, Cic.; *plātēa*, Plin.) is erroneously described as being in the habit of forcibly depriving other birds (such as sea-mews) of the prey which they have captured. The stork (*cicōnia*), *C. alba*, protected by law in many districts (as in Thessaly) owing to its usefulness in the destruction of snakes, became an article of diet in Rome. There were disputes on the question as to who was the first to make the great discovery of serving up young storks for dinner. The Egyptian *ibis* fed on locusts, caterpillars, and snakes, and for this last reason (says Cicero, *N.D.* i 101) was justly held in honour by the Egyptians. Strabo tells us that in Alexandria all the streets swarmed with them. The crested bird, the loudly screaming *parra* (Plaut., Hor., Plin.), the Umbrian *parfa*, was an important element in the taking of the auspices. Its identity has been much discussed, but there is no doubt that it was the lapwing (*Vanellus cristatus*).

67. The wading birds are seldom mentioned. But the snipe (*scōlōpax*) is named as an object of sport by Nemesianus. The *trōchilus*, or Egyptian plover, *Pluvianus aegyptius*, was anciently said to pick the leeches out of the crocodile's mouth,—a statement which has been confirmed in modern times. The purple gallinule (*porphyrio*) *P. caeruleus*, was prized for the beauty of its plumage; the finest were imported from Commagene. They were usually kept in sacred precincts, and were not eaten. The ruff, *Machetes pugnax*, probably gave rise to the legend of the 'birds of Memnon' (*āves Memnonides*, Plin. x 74).

68. The flamingo (*phoenicoptērus*), *Ph. roseus*, is among the most beautiful of birds. The taste of its fleshy tongue is highly commended by Apicius. The tongues of this bird were served up at the table of Vitellius, and their brains at that of the demented Heliogabalus. The swan (*ōlōr*) was also known by the Greek name of *cycnus*. There were two kinds. The *Cycnus olor*, the 'mute swan,' lived, all the year round, in Italy; the *C. musicus*, the 'whistling' or 'whooper swan,' visited Greece (and doubtless Italy also) in the winter alone. The latter is the theme of the stories of the strange beauty of the bird's dying song. Writers as early

as Pliny had their doubts as to the 'song of the swan', but Pliny himself only knew the *cycnus olor*. This common kind was artificially fattened by the Romans, who, with this object, used to sew up the eyelids of these (and of many other) birds. The goose (*anser*), the bird of Juno, with its ancient Indo-Germanic name, used to be fattened by the Romans as early as the time of the elder Cato. In later times large flocks of geese were kept (*χηνοβοσκεία*). Their livers, which were artificially enlarged by means of a diet of figs, were regarded as a great delicacy ('ficatum', the modern *foie gras*; 'pinguibus et ficis pastum iecur anseris albi', Hor.). Varro knew of two kinds of geese:—(1) the common white kind, and (2) the 'variegated,' or 'wild' species, which was difficult to domesticate. The finest down was obtained from small white geese, *gantae*, captured in Germany (Plin. x 54). Many thousands of geese were driven year by year to Rome from the land of the Mörini in Northern Gaul. Ducks, with their Indo-Germanic name, represented in Latin by *ānātes* and in German by *Enten*, were of several kinds, distinguished by names which are mainly Greek, without any further description. The only name with an apparently Latin sound is *querquedula* (from the Greek form *κερκεθάλις*), probably the common teal, *Querquedula crecca*. This species, as well as the common duck, was kept in a special preserve (*νησσοτροφείον*). The eggs of wild ducks were collected with a view to their being hatched by hens. The *Diomēdēae āues* of Pliny (x 120) have been conjecturally identified as the sheldrake, *Anas tadorna*, but they are more probably some kind of petrel. The gull or sea-mew (*gāuia*), *Larus flavipes*, is quite correctly described by Apuleius (*Met.* v 28). The pelican (*ὄνδρῶτάλυς*, Plin.), *Pelecanus crispus*, was brought to Rome as a curiosity, from the Northern coast of Gaul.

### C. AMPHIBIA AND REPTILES.

69. Four kinds of tortoises (*testūdīnes*) are distinguished by Pliny (xxxii 32 f): the land-tortoise, *T. Graeca* or *T. marginata*; the (Indian) sea-tortoise, *Chelonia cephalo*; the freshwater tortoise, *Testudinata*. *Emys lutaria*; and the river-tortoise, *Emys europaea*. The flesh of the tortoise was not eaten. The tortoise-shell now used in the industrial arts is obtained from the 'hawk's bill' or 'tortoise-shell turtle', the *Chelonia imbriata* of the Indian archipelago.

70. Frogs (*rānae*) and toads (*rūbētae*) were often confounded with one another. Neither the frog nor the toad was used as an article of diet; both were considered poisonous, but the frog was regarded as the less poisonous of the two. The tree-frog, *Hyla arborea*, is described as a 'uiridissima rana'. The life-history of the frog was in Pliny's eyes an inscrutable mystery (ix 159, 'naturae occulta ratione').

71. The crocodile of the Nile is often mentioned, and all kinds of stories were told of its relations to the ichneumon and the trochilus (§ 67). It was sometimes exhibited in the Circus. The crocodile of the Ganges is also mentioned by Pliny. By the term *lācerata*, *Sauria*.

or lizard, either *L. viridis* or *L. muralis* is generally meant. Its powers of recuperation were very greatly exaggerated. The changes of the colours of the chamaeleon were well known. The gecko (*stellio*), *Lacerta gecko*, was wrongly regarded as a malignant reptile. The salamander (*salamandra*) was supposed to be capable of extinguishing fire, and of killing multitudes of human beings, whereas it is quite harmless to man, and, at the most, can only run across one or two burning coals without taking harm.

72. Snakes abounded in India and Africa; some species of gigantic size were found in Libya and in India, which also produced the hooded snake or cobra-de-capello (*aspis*), and an exceedingly venomous viper (*uipera*), not more than a span in length. The Libyan serpents are enumerated in Lucan ix, and, among them, the fabulous 'flying dragons'. Frequent mention is made of the Egyptian asp, with which Cleopatra is said to have put an end to her existence. It was the Egyptian symbol of royalty; it was also the 'serpent' of the Biblical account of the 'enchantments' of the 'magicians of Egypt', who were baffled by Aaron in the palace of Pharaoh. Various methods of juggling with serpents were practised by the African Psylli; similarly in Italy a definite tribe, that of the Marsi, was skilled in the art of conjuring with snakes. Of the Italian snakes the most important was the venomous South-European viper (*sēps*) *Vipera aspis*; the harmless ringed snake (*cōluber*, *cōlubra*), *Coluber* or *Tropidonotus natrix*, which was erroneously supposed to be exceedingly venomous; and the equally harmless *T. viperinus*. The last two probably correspond to the Latin terms *natrix* and *hydrus*. The 'serpent of Aesculapius', a kind of *Coluber*, which the ancients rightly regarded as harmless, was brought from Epidaurus to Rome for ceremonial purposes, and it is still to be found in most of the watering-places where the Romans recognised the existence of medicinal healing springs. It is stated that, by the advice of Hannibal, venomous serpents were put to use in war by the Carthaginians at the siege of Saguntum, and by Prusias, king of Bithynia, in a naval engagement with the Pergamene king, Eumenes II.

#### D. FISHES.

73. The delicacy of the Roman taste for the choicest kinds of fish has long been known. Among those that were most highly prized, were several species of *Acanthopteri*, or fishes with hard bones and prickly fins:—the bass (*lupus*), *Labrax lupus*, a fish regarded as of the first rank, but only when it was caught in certain definite places (Col. viii 16); the mullet (*mullus*); the sea-mullet (*mūgil*, also called *cāpito* or *cēphālus*, and kept in fish preserves). Of the *Pharyngognathi*, the 'ruminating' parrot-fish (*scārus*), *S. creticus*, was bred as a delicacy. Of the *Anacanthini*, or soft-finned fishes, we may mention the *rhomus*, with its two species, the pearl-fish, *Rhombus lacris*, common in the Mediterranean, and the less common turbot, *R. maximus*. Of the *Physostomi*, we may name the *Murenidae*, including the eel (*anguilla*), *A. vulgari*; the conger-eel (*conger*), *C. vulgaris*;



the 'murry' (*mūrēna*), *M. helena*, a species of 'sea eel'; and, of the *Chondrostei*, the sturgeon (*acipenser*), *A. sturio*. Among the highly prized table-fishes of the Provinces were the sheath fish (*sīlūrus*) of the Nile, the Danube, the Mosel, and the Dnieper; the trout and salmon-trout (*sālār* and *salmo*, Aus.), and the pike (*lūcius*, Aus.). Of the fishes above named the finest were the mullet and the *murena*. In the most brilliant age of Rome no banquet with any pretensions to luxury was considered complete without a large mullet (*mullus*, *τρίγλη*, mod. *triglia*). In the time of Caligula a single mullet of exceptional size was sold for 8000 sesterces (£80). Those below two pounds in weight were left for the common people. The mullet was sometimes placed in a glass vessel and brought to the table alive, and cooked in the presence of the guests, who found a strange pleasure in contemplating all the varying hues which it assumed in the agony of death (Plin. ix 66). The Roman passion for the *murena* is notorious. It was a favourite fish with Hortensius and Crassus. It was usually preserved in salt-water tanks. Vedius Pollio, whose father was once a slave, was in the habit of feeding his *murenæ* with the flesh of his own slaves, to the general indignation of Rome, which found itself unable to make him amenable to any existing law. The best kinds of *murena* were those of Tartessus and Messana, and of the Carpathian sea. Next in importance to the mullet and the *murena*, was the turbot. The best were caught off Ravenna; and here too the value of the fish depended on its size. The fancy for the largest sizes of turbot is the theme of one of the finest *Satires* of Juvenal (iv). A closely allied fish is the 'prickly flounder' (*passer*), *Platessa passer*, mentioned by Horace as a fish for the table (*Serm.* ii 8, 29). Eels were also a favourite dish. The largest numbers were caught in the Lago di Garda, where that lake discharges itself into the river Mincius. They were captured by means of a special kind of apparatus, as is still the custom at Comacchio in the same neighbourhood. The common people set a special value on the mackerel (*scomber*), and the anchovy (*apua*, Apic.), *Engraulis encrasicolus*, both of which were used in making a tasty kind of sauce (*gārum*); also the tunny (*thynnus*), *T. vulgaris*, and the atherina (Aristot.) or sand-smelt, *A. hepsetus*. Vast shoals of these fishes frequented the Italian seas, and, with the exception of the atherina (which was eaten fresh), were salted and smoked in large quantities and made into *garum*. The best mackerels of the Mediterranean were caught off the coast of Spain. Among the fishes which were not used for food, may be mentioned the sword-fish (*gladius*), *Xiphias gladius*, the foe of the whale and the tunny; the sucking-fish (*ēchēnēis*), *E. remora*, to which very remarkable powers were attributed; the cramp-fish or electric ray (*torpēdo*), *Raia torpedo*, the properties of which are correctly described by Pliny and Aelian; the sting-ray (*trygon* or *pastīnāca*), *Raia pastinaca*; and various kinds of sharks, such as the *mustēla* (Enn.) or *cānis* (Plin.), the most frequent species in the Mediterranean being the smooth dog-fish, *Galeus canis*, and the smooth hound-fish, *Mustelus vulgaris*.



## E. INVERTEBRATES.

74. Earthworms and intestinal worms are alike termed *lumbricus*. The tape-worm is *taenia* or *lumbricus latus*. The scolopendra of Pliny (Lat. *multipes*, Isid., or *centipes*, Gloss.), is a kind of multipede, or *Millipeda*, which was supposed to be venomous. *Hirūdo* (later, *sanguisūga*) is the leech, frequent in S. Europe, long in use for blood-letting. Crabs of all kinds abounded in the seas

Crustacea. and streams of Italy. Their Latin names were *cancer* (crab), *locusta* (cray-fish), *squilla*, *cammarus* or *gammārus* (shrimp). The ancient cookery-books include recipes for the preparation of the lobster, and for crab-soup (*zōmō-tēgānītē*, Apic.), and, in Petronius, we have a *locusta marina* served up at table. Fried shrimps were supposed to whet the appetite (Hor.). In general, however, crabs played a very subordinate part as delicacies, though their meat was regarded as an antidote to all kinds of poison. The harmless species of spider was called *arānea*;

Arachnida. venomous spiders (*solpūgae* or *phalangia*), regarded with fear in Greece, Asia and Africa, were (according to Pliny) unknown in Italy. Scorpions, however, were well known:—the small house-scorpion (*scorpio*), *Buthus europaeus*, which is harmless; the field-scorpion. *B. occitanus*, a venomous species found in Italy; and the far more dangerous African rock-scorpion (*nēpa*), *Scorpio aser*, which was brought to Italy by the Psylli and the snake-charmers of Libya.

75. As early as the time of Plautus, the bug (*cimex*), *C. lectularius*, was only too well known in Rome. There is no ground for Insecta. the assertion of Beckmann (*Hist. Nat. Vet.* 56) that it only reached Europe shortly before the Christian era.

The flea (*pūlex*) is mentioned by Plautus; the 'jumper' is the literal meaning of its ancient Indo-Germanic name; a spurious poem *de pulice* has come down to us under the name of Ovid. The louse (*pēdicūlus*) is also noticed by Plautus; and, in still earlier times, Democritus and Pherecydes are said to have died of *phthiriāsis* (Cassius Felix), a malady which is by no means fabulous, as Mommsen and many others have supposed.

76. The *ācāda*, *C. ornī*, mentioned by poets such as Virgil and Ovid, was, in ordinary life, hardly noticed by the unidyllic Romans; Orthoptera. its chirping note was described by the verb *fritinnire*. The locust (*lūcusta*), especially the *Acridium peregrinum* and *Oedipoda migratoria*, was disagreeably familiar, owing to its appalling predatory incursions into Italy, and particularly into Apulia, Campania, and even Latium itself (Liv. xlii 2). The common cricket (*grillus*) was well known. *Musca*

Diptera. (for *muvea*), with its Indo-Germanic name (cp. Germ. *mücke*, Eng. *midge*), is the common house-fly. *Cūlex* is the gnat, against which protection was sought in the use of curtains (*cōnōpia*). Mosquitos, 'musculae minutissimae, sed aculeis permolestae' (Isid. xii 8, 14).

known as *scinīphes* or *cinīfes*, σκνῖπες, κνῖπες, became a perfect plague in the time of Domitian (Oros. vii 27, 6). The *musca canina* is often mentioned (Oros. l. c. § 7). The moth (*tīnēā*, σῆς) was an object of detestation, and the same is true of the cockroach (*blatta*, Lepidoptera. σῖλφη); still more hateful was the gadfly, popularly called the *tābānnus* or *āsīlus*, the *oestrus* (οἰστρος) of the poets. The different species of caterpillars, *ērūcae* or *ūrūcae* (Plin.), *tīneae* (Ov.), or *campae* (Plaut.), and of butterflies (*pāpīlīōnes*), were not distinguished. As the gardens were ravaged by the former, and the beehives by the latter (Col., Pallad.), both alike were persecuted. The only names of caterpillars that we know are *galba* (Suet. *Galba*, 3, 'tam exilis quam sunt animalia quae in aesculis nascuntur appellanturque galbae'), *Bombyx aesculi*; and perhaps *uolucra* (Col.), the 'leaf-roller', *Tortrix*; and *scrūpēda* (Varro), the 'woolly-bear', *Arctia caja*. The generic term, *ūrūca*, is often specially applied to the larva of the cabbage-butterfly. An exceptional interest attaches to the '*bombyx uermiculus*, qui longissima ex se fila generat, quorum textura *bombycinum* dicitur, conficiturque in insula Coa' (Isid.). This refers to the *Lasiocampa otus*, the *bombyx* of Pliny, the 'silk' of whose cocoons was used to manufacture the semi-transparent *Coae uestes*. Robes of silk (*sērīcae*), the more valuable product of the genuine silk-worm, were imported from China, the land of the *Sērēs*, until the eggs of the silk-worm were introduced into Europe in the time of Justinian (552). Thus far for the *Orthoptera*, the *Diptera*, and the *Lepidoptera*. Of the *Hymenoptera*, Hymenoptera. the most important is the bee (*āpīs*; etymologically = ἐμπίς, 'the stinger'). The care of bees and their manner of life in general, have been described by Varro, Columella, Pliny and Palladius, and best of all by Virgil in his *Fourth Georgic*. His account is correct, except in two points, the fable as to the origin of bees from the putrid carcase of an ox, and the description of the queen bee as a male (*rex*). Honey, in ancient times, took the place of our sugar. In Rome the best kinds of honey were those imported from Hybla in Sicily, and from Tarentum. In the imperial age vain attempts were made to acclimatise in Italy the bees of Hymettus and the thyme of Attica. Large quantities of honey were imported into Rome, not only from Attica, but also from Liguria, and from Turdetania in Spain. The worst kinds came from Sardinia. Spain was the source of the best wax, the 'so-called Punic wax' (Plin.). In Italy the wax produced among the Paeligni and the Etruscans was the finest. The bee of the Greeks and Romans, *Apis ligustica*, was rather smaller than our own, *A. mellifica*. Hornets (*crabrones*) and wasps (*uespae*) are occasionally mentioned. The wasp has a primitive Indo-Germanic name (*uespa*, σφήξ, *wespe*, O. H. G. *wefsa*). The hornet was the most formidable foe of the bee (Virg.). Poets, as well as moralists in prose (such as Cicero and Plutarch), praise the ant (*formīca*) for the foresight with which it stores in summer the provender which it needs for the winter. (In southern climes, it is not in the habit of becoming dormant during the winter-season.) Roman farmers,

however, detested the ant, and did their best to destroy it. The ancients were well aware that ants formed a kind of duly ordered community, and that they attained to remarkable results by the division of labour (Plin. *N. H.* xi 108 f; Plutarch, *De sollertia animalium*, c. xi; Theophrast).

77. The Romans were as little interested in beetles as in butterflies.

The only genuine Italian name, *taurus* (Isid.), denotes a

Coleoptera. *scarabaeus silvestris*, i.e. the stag-beetle, *Lucanus cervus*.

The general name was *scarabaeus*, a word derived from the Greek *κάραβος*; it has passed into all the Romance languages (e.g. Fr. *escarbot*), and may therefore be assumed to have been the colloquial Latin term. *Curculio*

or *gurgulio* (Cato, Varro, Persius, Col., Pallad.) is used to designate, not only the black weevil, *Curculio granarius* or *Calandra granaria*, but also the white corn-moth, *Tinea granella*.

78. *Purpura*, *murex*, or the 'purple dye', was produced from the

secretions of a gland in certain species of *Murex* (*brandaris*,  
Mollusca. *trunculus*), and possibly also of *Purpura* (*haemastoma*), which

occur all over the Mediterranean. *M. brandaris* is figured on coins of Tarentum (Imhoof-Blumer u. Keller, viii 30), where there are still traces of the factories, and *M. trunculus* on coins of Tyre (*ib.* viii 33): at Sidon huge heaps of the broken shells are still visible. The exact colour produced seems to have varied from dark red to violet or purple. In the age of Constantine the true imperial purple was specially manufactured in Tyre. Purple robes (*vestes conchyliatae*) were worn by Roman matrons in the time of the elder Cato. Latin authors from Plautus downwards attest the use of various mollusca (*conchae*, *conchyliæ*, *testæ*) as articles of food. A favourite dish was the great scallop, *Pecten jacobaeus*; 'pectinibus patulis iactat se molle Tarentum' (Hor. *Serm.* ii 4, 34). *Mitili*, *mütüli*, *mýtili*, which were eaten by all classes, may denote our 'mussel' (*Mytilus edulis*), or more probably some form of 'moule', e.g. *Tapes*, *Tellina*, or the smaller *Veneridae*. We find frequent mention of oysters (*ostrææ*), the most famous places for their production being Tarentum, Brundisium, Circeii and the *étangs* of Campania. The oysters of Cumae and Baiæ date from 90 B.C., when Sergius Orata formed his celebrated preserves in the Lucrine lake. The oysters of Circeii, the Lucrine, and Rutupiae (Richborough) are easily distinguished by the gourmand in Juvenal (iv 141). In the *cena pontificalis* given by Lentulus Spinther in 50 B.C., the menu of which has been preserved by Macrobius (iii 13), the *hors d'œuvre* include *ostreae crudæ*, *pêlorides* (no doubt the Lucrine *peloris* of Horace, *Serm.* ii 4, 32, not the 'giant' *Pinna*, but the delicate *Psammobia vespertina*), *sphondyli* (i.e. *spondylus gaederopus*), and possibly the smaller *Pectens*, and the 'purple shells' mentioned above. Pearl fisheries were, and still are, unknown in European seas. When Tacitus (*Agr.* 12) says that the 'British Ocean' produces 'margarita subiusca ac luentia', he can only refer to the dull 'seed' pearls found in *Mytilus*, *Ostrea*, or, rarely, in *Pinna*. Caesar must have been deluded if he went to Britain, as Suetonius

says (*Iul.* 47) 'spe margaritarum'. Pliny says the breastplate dedicated by Iulius Caesar to Venus Genetrix was adorned with pearls from Britain which were 'parui atque decolores'. When Mela (iii 6, 51) speaks of British rivers as 'margaritas generantia', he refers to pearls derived from the fresh-water mussel (*Unio margaritifera*).

79. The term *Cephalopodes* occurs in Cassius Felix, an African writer on medicine. Pliny (ix 83) distinguishes, of the *Decapoda*, the *lōlīgo* (possibly an *Ommastrephes*) and the *Sepia* (*officinalis*), and, of the *Octopoda*, the *pōlŷpŷs* (*Octopus vulgaris*). The *polyŷpus* of Corcyra was praised by Ennius as a food. Horace ('hic nigrae sucus loliginis') knew of the ink-scattering qualities of these creatures; the dried ink of the *sepia* was used in writing (*Pers.* iii 13). Cephalopoda.

80. Land Snails. Snails were a favourite article of diet, and besides being caught in the open, were bred in preserves (*coclearia*, *uiuaria*). The *cocleae Germanae* are definitely mentioned Gastropoda. by Pelagonius. The *Helix pomatia*, or great 'Roman snail' of our southern and midland counties, occurs all over France and Germany, in Italy it is replaced by other allied species (*lucorum*, *secernenda* etc.). Other kinds were imported, some, possibly *lactea*, from Africa, others from Illyria. Fulvius Hirpinus, in his *coclearia*, kept the species carefully apart; the *albulae* or small white species, from Reate, are particularised. Slugs (*limiŷces*) were exterminated as pests or used in medicine. Pliny thought they were immature snails, without the shell. The common black sea-urchin (*Echinus esculentus*) was a delicacy of the table; the best, according to Horace, 'Miseno oriuntur'. Coral (*curalium*, *Lucr.*, *Ov.*, *curallium*, *Plin.*, *Solin.*, *corallum*, *Auien.*, *Sidon.*) was erroneously regarded as a plant. The 'sea nettle' (*urtica marina*, *Plaut.*, *urtica*, *Plin.*, *Apic.*; ἀκαλήφῃ) is one of the *Medusae*. In Pliny's opinion, it was neither an animal nor a plant, but a combination of the two; and he says the same of the sponge, *spongia* (ix 146).

Pliny's *Natural History* includes an uncritical yet invaluable compilation of a large number of details relating to the Fauna of the ancients. Bibliography. The only Latin writer, who appears to have had a real taste for zoology, was Apuleius (born c. 130 A.D.); but, unfortunately, in his extant works, he never deals directly with the subject. Among modern works on the Fauna of Latin literature, the following may be mentioned:—W. Turner's *Birds noticed by Pliny and Aristotle* (Colon. 1544), 'the first book on Birds which treats them in...a scientific spirit'; 'almost every page bears witness to a personal knowledge of the subject', ed. A. H. Evans, Cambridge, 1903. Harald Othmar Lenz, *Zoologie der alten Griechen und Römer*, Gotha, 1856 (a collection of *loci classici* with comments on the subject-matter, which are of value, though unscholarly and uncritical). Rev. W. Houghton, *Gleanings from the Natural History of the Ancients* (London, Paris, and New York, s.a.), illustrated sketches giving a superficial account of little more than a hundredth part of the extant materials. Otto Keller, *Thiere des classischen Alterthums in culturgeschichtlicher Beziehung*, 488 pp., with 56 illustrations, Innsbruck, 1887, a work which deals with about one-third of the more interesting animals, and, in the case of these, lays



a foundation for further research and *Die antike Tierwelt*, Leipzig, Engelmann, 1909-12, 2 vols. with many illustrations; also Imhoof-Blumer and Otto Keller, *Tier- und Pflanzenbilder auf Münzen und Gemmen des klass. Altertums*, with 1352 photographic reproductions, Leipzig, Teubner, 1889.

Many details have been discussed in scattered papers and programs, which cannot here be fully enumerated. We may, however, mention W. Gemoll, *Realien bei Horaz*, i 1-32, Berlin, 1892, and some of the publications of the *Verein für Folk-lore und Linguistics in Prag*; also certain articles in Pauly's (and especially in Pauly-Wissowa's) *Realencyklopädie*, and in Daremberg et Saglio, *Dict. des antiquités*, 1875 f.

## II. 2. FLORA.

81. IN the present article there will be no attempt to ascertain the amount of technical knowledge of plants to which the Romans attained. It will be sufficient to enumerate the plants which were familiar to the Augustan poets, and therefore presumably to their readers. This will summarise the common knowledge possessed by the educated people of the time. But the task, so limited, is not without scientific interest. One of the best defined botanical regions of the world is that which extends from North-West India to the Atlantic, and includes the Mediterranean basin. This has been the scene of successive civilisations, and each has passed on westward the culture of the plants it had domesticated, and the knowledge of those whose usefulness it had discovered. If modern Europe has carried the arts of horticulture to a point of which the Romans could not have dreamed, the historic sense is gratified in tracing its incipient stages.

The products of the indigenous flora of Italy were scanty. The land was mostly covered with dense forest. The primitive peoples grew spelt, barley and millet brought by nomadic races from the East, and a few plants of native origin. These were pulses; the bean, pease and lentil; and potherbs; cabbage, turnip, and garlic. They gathered such wild fruits as were edible (*agrestia poma*) including the apple, pear and wild grapes; and they cultivated the perennial flax. In a later age the products of Italy consisted chiefly of corn, wood, and cattle. At the height of its prosperity, it became, as Varro described it, a great fruit-garden.

An enormous amount of labour and ingenuity has been expended on the identification of the plant-names found in Roman literature. Much has been wasted. The mediaeval and even later commentators did not grasp the fact that plants are limited in their range, and they expected to find in Central Europe those of Mediterranean countries. Still less is it admissible to seek in the Classics for plants which did not reach Europe till the Middle Ages, or for those of the New World. The difficulties of the subject, however, mostly yield to common sense. The Latin poets



were not botanists, and would have been unintelligible to their public, if they had been. Virgil is the most copious source to be drawn upon, especially from the pastoral side. His occasional descriptions, almost technical in their accuracy, show that he could be a keen observer. But his method, always literary, is sometimes elusive: he constantly translates from Theocritus, and the result is ambiguous, as the plants of Greece and Italy are by no means always identical. Ovid drew more directly from nature; *amnicolae salices* calls up to the mind the picture of a willow-fringed stream, where Virgil is content with the conventional epithets, *lenta* or *glauca*.

The Romans knew nothing of modern classification. They often group plants on superficial grounds, which we are accustomed to regard as widely dissimilar, under the same name. Virgil himself warns us of this:—*‘praeterea genus haud unum, nec fortibus ulmis, | nec salici, lotoque, neque Idaeis cyparissis’*.

Virgil, in his *Fourth Georgic*, has declined to ‘sing of gardens’, and our loss is only imperfectly repaired by the 436 lines of the tenth book of Columella, who also writes (in prose) of gardens (xi), and of vines (iii), and of olives and other trees (v). Horace and Martial usefully supplement the list by giving us plant-names as they entered into urban life. In Pliny’s *Natural History*, the books on Botany (xii—xxvii) are largely compiled from Greek as well as Roman sources, and from the lost work of Juba, king of Mauretania. Pliny, as compared with his predecessors, Cato, Varro, and Columella, gives little proof of a first-hand knowledge of the subject of those books.

82. Oak, the once dominant tree of Europe, has three names. Of these *robur* was applied to any hard wood; Virgil uses it of the olive, ‘*morsus roboris*’, as well as for the oak itself, ‘*antiquo robore quercus*’. The oak alone can be meant in his fine description of the *aesculus*:—‘*aesculus in primis, quae, quantum uertice ad auras | aetherias, tantum radice in Tartara tendit*’. *Quercus* is clear, as the name comes down to us, through the Old French *quesne*, in the modern *chêne*. It was the pedunculate, while *aesculus* was the sessile-fruited, oak. The latter has more ample foliage, ‘*quae maxima frondet*’, Virg., ‘*frondosus*’, Ov. Horace speaks of ‘*aesculus woods*’ in Apulia, ‘*Daunia in latis alit aesculetis*’, and the pedunculate oak does not seem to descend beyond Central Italy. The *corona cinica* was made of its leaves, ‘*aesculeae capiebat frondis honorem*’, Ov. Holm-Oak (*ilex*) is one of the most characteristic of Italian trees, though now rivalled by the Olive, which it somewhat resembles. Virgil’s *sub arguta ilice* hits off the rustling of its harsh foliage. The acorns had to be *shaken down* to feed swine, ‘*de concussa tantum pluit ilice glandis*’. Cork-tree (*suber*); the bark was *cortex*, *raptus de subere cortex*, Virg.; it furnished bungs, Horace’s *corticem adstrictum pice*.

Beech (*fagus*) is the best of all shade-giving trees; ‘*inter densas, umbrosa cacumina, fagos*’, Virg. Names cut in the smooth bark

enlarge as it yields with growth :—‘*incisae seruant a te mea nomina fagi | et quantum trunci, tantum mea nomina crescunt*’, Ov. Drinking-cups were made of the wood, *pocula fagina*, Virg., and it is excellent firewood, *ueteris ramalia fagi*, Pers. Ash (*fraxinus*) is described by Ovid as *utilis hastis*, as it still is in the British army. Manna Ash (*ornus*), ‘*saxosis montibus orni*’, Virg. Elm (*ulmus*) might almost be called the Roman footmark. Though dominating southern England, it betrays its foreign origin by rarely seeding. It propagates itself by ‘suckers’, ‘*pullulat ab radice aliis densissima silua | ut cerasis ulmisque*’, Virg. Its principal use was for training vines, *amictae uitibus ulmi*, Ov. and Columella, for which it was planted in rows, *in uersum distulit ulmos*, Virg.; in modern Italy it has been replaced by the white mulberry. Wooden models for practising carving upon were made of elm, ‘*tota sonat ulmea cena Suburra*’, Juv., and it was used in the construction of ploughs, ‘*curui formam accipit ulmus aratri*’, Virg. Bass (*tilia*). Ovid’s ‘*tiliae molles*’ (*Tilia parvifolia* of botanists); *philyra* was the bark, used for the bands of chaplets. The wood was used for yokes, ‘*caeditur et tilia ante iugo leuis*’, Virg. Oriental Plane (*platanus*). An Asiatic tree reaching its western limit in Greece, whence it was introduced into Italy; the London Plane is a variety. As with us, the Plane was planted by the Romans in their gardens for shade. Ovid calls it *genialis*, and Horace *caelebs*, because it did not support the vine. Abele (*populus*). Ovid’s ‘*Herculeae populus alba comae*’. Alder (*alnus*). Likes moisture, ‘*crassisque paludibus alni*’, Virg. It was used for water conduits, ‘*alnos...fluuii sensere cauatas*’, Virg. Virgil makes the *Heliadum nemus* either of poplar or alder. Italian Maple (*acer*). Ovid’s ‘*acer...coloribus impar*’, perhaps from its autumnal coloration. The hard wood was used in carpentry, ‘*trabibus contextit acernis*’, Virg.; for writing-tablets; and for dining-tables, ‘*norunt lautas et mea ligna dapes*’, Mart. Hornbeam (*carpinus*). Tool-handles were made of the wood, ‘*manubria, quorum optima sunt iligneae, deinde carpinia*’, Col. Nettle Tree (*lotos*). Still known as Lotu in Sicily. Ovid calls it *aquatica*. The hard wood continues to be used for musical instruments, ‘*horrendo lotos adunca sono*’, Ov. Bay (*laurus*). Virgil’s ‘*odoratum lauri nemus*’, Ovid’s ‘*innuba laurus*’, in memory of Daphne. It was the symbol of victory, ‘*uictrices lauros...gerens*’, Tib. Tiberius wore a crown of laurel to protect him from lightning. The Greek name δάφνη was occasionally used in Latin, ‘*baccis redimita daphne*’, Petr. Willows (*salix*), used for basket-work shields, ‘*salignas umbonum crates*’, Virg. The American vines were tied with the purple willow; *Amerina retinacula*, Virg. Virgil’s ‘*molle siler*’ is by general consent, some kind of willow. Terebinth (*terebinthus*), whence ‘turpentine’. The hard wood was used for furniture, ‘*thalamo Oriciae terebinthi | effutum*’, Prop., and inlaid with ivory, ‘*quale per artem | inclusum buxo aut Oricia terebintho | lucet ebur*’, Virg.

The native coniferous trees are pretty completely noticed. Silver

Fir (*abies*). 'abies in montibus altis', Virg.; much used for shipbuilding, 'casus abies uisura marinos', Virg. Spruce (*picea*). 'lucus nigranti picea . . obscurus', Virg.; it yielded Phrygian pitch, 'Idaeasque pices', Virg., as now in Burgundy. Stone Pine (*pinus*). Conspicuous in the landscape of modern Italy, it was brought from its native Greece; 'pulcherrima pinus in hortis', Virg.; 'imminens uillae . . pinus', Hor. Scotch and Corsican Pines; probably both included in Virgil's *nautica pinus*. The former was used for torches, as still in Scotland, 'piceum fert humida lumen taeda', Virg.; Ovid calls Ceres *taedifera*. Larch (*larix*). Prickly Cedar (*cedrus*). Really a juniper; the wood was fragrant, 'odoratam stabulis accendere cedrum', Virg. Ancestral images were made of it; the oily distillate<sup>1</sup> was used to preserve books from decay, 'carmina linenda cedro', Hor. Juniper (*juniperus*). 'iuniperi grauis umbra', Virg. Cypress (*cupressus*). A tree of W. Asian origin, only naturalised in Europe, as Virgil seems to have recognised, 'ipsae Caucaseo steriles in uertice siluae | . . dant alios aliae fetus, dant utile lignum | nauigiis pinus, domibus cedrumque cupressosque'. Ovid compares it to the goals of the circus, 'metas imitata cupressus'. It was a symbol of mourning, 'ferales cupressos', Virg. Never has the bitterness of death been more accentuated than by Horace, 'neque harum, quas colis, arborum | te, praeter inuisas cupressos, | ulla breuem dominum sequetur'. Yew (*taxus*). Used for bows, as still in Scotland, 'taxi torquentur in arcus', Virg. It is poisonous to cattle, 'nocentes', Virg.

83. Some of the more important shrubs find their place here; others later under 'Bee-plants'. Myrtle (*myrtus*) abounds on rocky Native Shrubs. shores, 'amantes litora myrtos', Virg. It was sacred to Venus, 'gratissima Veneri', Virg.; and a coronary plant, 'cingens materna tempora myrto', Virg., of Augustus, who claimed to be descended from Venus. Box (*buxus*). 'perpetuoque uirens buxus', Ov. The Romans were fond of ornamenting their gardens with shrubs clipped by the art of the *topiarius*; and the box lends itself readily to this treatment, 'tonsile buxetum', Mart. Privet (*ligustrum*). 'alba ligustra cadunt', Virg., 'niuei ligustri', Ov., 'candidior ligustro', Mart. Tamarisk (*myrica*). 'pinguia corticibus sudent electra myricae', Virg., as of something impossible. Laurustinus (*tinus*). 'baccis caerula tinus', Ov. Lentisk (*lentiscus*). 'cuspides lentisci', Mart., tooth-picks. Wayfaring tree (*uiburnum*). 'lenta uiburna', Virg. Danewort (*ebulus*). 'sanguineis ebuli baccis', Virg., referring to the juice, as the berries are black. Christ's Thorn (*paliurus*). 'spinis . . paliurus acutis', Virg. Dyer's Greenweed (*genista*) fits Virgil's epithets *lentae* and *humiles*; some prefer the 'Spanish Broom', which suits better Martial's 'pira quae longa pendent religata genista'. Butcher's broom (*ruscum*), 'horridior rusco', and 'aspera rusci uimina per siluam', Virg.; 'sepes horrida rusco', Col. Ivy (*hedera*). Sacred to Bacchus, 'gratissima Baccho', Ov. The Poets' Ivy, with which

<sup>1</sup> Huile de Cade.

they were crowned, 'doctarum hederæ præmia frontium', Hor., is supposed to have been the yellow-berried sort, *hedera pæliens*. Mistletoe (*uiscum*). Virgil is at his best in his description:—'discolor unde auri per ramos aura refulsit | quale solet siluis, brumali frigore, uiscum | fronde uirere noua, quod non sua seminat arbos'. Birdlime was made from it, 'fallere uisco', Virg.

84. Virgil enumerates the plants visited by bees, 'crura thymo plenæ, pascuntur et arbuta passim | et glaucas salices, casiamque, crocumque rubentem | et pinguem tiliam, et ferrugineos hyacinthos'. Cretan Thyme (*thymus*) takes the first place, 'redolentque thymo fragrantia mella', Virg.; the *Thymus capitatus* of botanists, confined to S. Europe. Thyme (*serpyllum*). 'olentia late serpylla', Virg. *Thymbra*. Savory, a native of the Troad and Syria. 'grauiter spirantis copia thymbrae', Virg. *Casia*. A Spurge-laurel (*Daphne Gnidium*) with sweet-scented flowers; 'humiles apibus casias...ministrat', Virg. Saffron (*crocus*). Native; 'crocumque rubentem', Virg. refers, not to the colour of the flower, but to that of the dye from it. Ovid describes the former, 'filaque puniceï languida facta croci'. Columella says 'coloret odoretque mella.' Certain plants were used to attract bees to the hives. Balm (*melisphyllum*); 'trita melisphylla', Virg. Honeywort (*cerintha*); 'cerinthe ignobile gramen', Virg. Greater Centaury (*centaurea*); 'græue olentia centaurea', Virg.; the root was fragrant; Lucretius notes its bitter taste. Virgil also recommends burning *galbanum* (see later); 'galbaneos incendere odores'.

85. The meadows of the South are gay with flowers, which were gathered with almost child-like pleasure. 'Sunt et sine nomine flores', says Ovid. They were woven into garlands (*coronæ*) for decking the images of the gods, or for personal adornment:—'nec flos ullus hiat pratis, quin ille decenter | impositus fronti langueat ante meæ', Prop.

Martagon Lily (*hyacinthus*). This has much troubled the commentators. That it was a lily is clear from Ovid:—'flos oritur formamque capit quam lilia, si non | purpureus color his, argenteus esset in illis'. Columella, following Virgil, has 'ferrugineis hyacinthis', which agrees with the dusky red colour of the flowers. The petals were marked with something resembling letters, 'AI AI flos habet inscriptum', Ov., in memory of Hyacinthus killed by Apollo. It was also supposed to commemorate Ajax, 'littera communis mediis pueroque uiroque | inscripta est foliis: hæc nominis, illa querellæ'. Virgil asks the riddle:—'dic quibus in terris inscripti nomina regum | nascantur flores'. What the Greeks meant is more doubtful. Virgil, borrowing from Theocritus, has, 'et nigrae uiolæ sunt et uaccinia nigra', where 'uaccinium' replaces *ῥάκινθος*. Hence Milton's 'hyacinthin locks'. It was a squill-like plant (Diosc.). Columella's 'caelestis luminis hyacinthus' and 'niueos uel caeruleos hyacinthos' was not improbably the oriental hyacinth, which is a native of Syria.

Wild Flowers  
and Garlands,  
*coronariæ*.

Bee-plants  
*apianæ*.



Amaranth (*amaranthus*). The Greek plant was the Gold-flower, one of the 'Everlastings' or 'Immortelles'. The Roman plant was something quite different, 'et color . . . purpureus | ut cum contexunt amarantis alba puellae lilia', Tib.; most probably the 'Love lies bleeding' of our gardens, of Asiatic origin. Violet (*violae nigrae*). *violae*, as with us, was a general term, 'omnes uiolae iactabo colores', Juv., including even the wallflower, though mostly restricted to the violet proper, which was cultivated in gardens, 'irriguumque bibant uiolaria fontem', Virg. Thus Ovid:—'si quis erat, factis de flore coronis | qui posset uiolas addere, diues erat'. *violae pallentes* merely translates λευκοτόν, which, it is generally agreed, was some cruciferous plant, not improbably 'Dame's violet', cf. Horace, 'tinctus uiola pallor amantium'. Melilot (*melilotos*); 'pars meliloton amant', Ov. Cyclamen (*baccar*); 'baccare frontem cingite', Virg.; the name *baccara* still exists in the mountains of Brescia, and the flowers are used for wreaths. Michaelmas Daisy (*amellus*). One of the plants, 'flos in pratis cui nomen amello', of which Virgil gives a detailed, almost botanical description. Altars, he adds, were often adorned with it. Marigold (*caltha*). 'mollia luteola pingit uaccinia caltha', Virg.; 'flammeola . . . caltha', and 'flauentia lumina calthae', Col. Rosemary (*ros marinus*). 'paruos coronantem marino | rore deos, fragilique myrto', Hor. Casia, 'casia atque aliis intexens suauibus herbis', Virg. (see above).

Among other wild plants we have:—Bryony (*uitis alba*). 'lentior . . . utibus albis', Ov. Bents (*stipula*); dried grass-stems which it is advisable to burn off, 'levem stipulam crepitantibus urere flammis', Virg. Sedge (*carex*); unsucculent herbage, 'frondibus hirsutis, et carice pastus acuta', Virg. *Ulua* was a wider term for aquatic vegetation, 'propter aquae riuum uiridi procumbit in ulua', Virg. Rush (*iuncus*) invaded undrained pastures, 'limosoque palus obducit pascua iunco', Virg. Bracken (*filix*) troubled the cultivator, 'flicem curuis inuisam pascit aratris', Virg. Maidenhair (*capillaris*); a native fern; the Latin name is the equivalent of the Greek τριχομανές, so called from its reputed power of stimulating scanty hair. It was employed as an unguent, which seems, however, to have been cheap, as Martial calls it 'pauperis capillare'. Black maidenhair (*polytrichon*) was used for the same purpose. Moss (*muscus*); bog-moss, 'stagna uirentia musco', Virg.; mossy rocks, 'musco circumlita saxa', Hor.; mossy soil, 'solum muscosum', Prop. Seaweed (*alga*); 'proiecta uilior alga', Virg., more worthless than sea-wrack.

86. The cultivation of cereals marks the passage from the nomadic to the pastoral stage. The commencement of that of wheat, barley, oats, and millet, is prehistoric, and nothing can be conjectured as to their origin, except that they spread westward from Asia.

Food-crops.  
Frumenta.

Spelt (*far*). An inferior race of wheat, 'robustaque farra', Virg., which the Romans, like the primitive inhabitants, cultivated, and probably in earlier times more than wheat itself. The grain was 'semen adorem',



Col. The flour, *ador*, was made into cakes, 'adorea liba', Virg. They were used in the marriage ceremony called *confarreatio*, ceremonial usage usually preserving what is otherwise obsolete; the ceremony itself survives in the wedding-cake. Wheat (*triticum*); 'triticeam in messem', Virg. *Frumentum* though used generally, like our 'corn', stands for wheat *par excellence*:—'frumenta in uiridi stipula lactantia turgent', Virgil, the milky corn swells in the leafy stem; 'nequiquam pingues palea teret area culmos', Virgil, if you grow it under shade, you may thresh the straw (*culmos*) and get nothing but chaff (*paleae*). Virgil (by metonymy) uses *arista*, properly meaning 'awn', or 'beard', for the whole ear, 'ne grauidis procumbat culmus aristis', and 'pingui glandem mutauit arista'. Ovid usually calls the ear *spica*:—e.g. 'spicis nitido flauentibus auro'. We may infer that the Romans grew bearded wheat. Virgil knew that a superior race could only be maintained by selection, 'ni uis humana quotannis maxima quaeque manu legeret'. Rust (*rubigo*); disease and the corn-thistle, 'the commonest pest of agriculture', still vex the farmer, 'ut mala culmos | esset rubigo, segnisque horreret in aruis | carduus', Virg. The *lappaeque tribulique*, which follow, are 'burdocks and caltrops'. Barley (*hordeum*); 'grandia saepe quibus mandauimus hordea sulcis | infelix lolium, et steriles dominantur auenae', Virg. The straw is weak compared with that of wheat, 'fragili hordea culmo', Virg. According to Columella both 'two-rowed', *distichum*, and 'six-rowed barley', *hexastichum*, Virgil's 'grandia', were grown. The grain was eaten in a sort of coarse porridge, as maize is now in Italy, 'iuuentus...grandi pasta polenta', Juv., 'tosta quod coxerat ante polenta', Ov. Darnel (*lolium*), the 'tares' of Scripture<sup>1</sup>. Wild Oats (*steriles auenae*). It is improbable that the Romans cultivated oats proper, which are a crop of cooler climates. *auenae* by itself stands probably for a crop of worthless grasses, like our 'couch'; ordinarily *auena*, in the singular, is any slender grass stem. Millet (*milium*) is mentioned only once by Virgil, 'milio uenit annua cura'. Both this and Italian Millet (*pānicum*), mentioned by Columella, had found their way from the East in prehistoric times. The Opium poppy (*papauer*) originated in the Mediterranean region, and is perhaps the solitary gift of its flora to the East. Virgil calls it 'uescum papauer', the fine-seeded poppy; his epithet 'Cereale', primarily, 'sacred to Ceres', may also refer to the use of its seeds for food (*anglice*, 'maw-seeds'). He was evidently familiar with the effects of opium, 'lethaeo perfusa papauera somno'. The drug was collected in Asia Minor, whence the Romans obtained it. The Arabs transmitted its use to the East through the Persians. The *smoking* of opium is a modern Chinese invention. Sesame (*sēsānum*), came westwards through Babylonia from Eastern Asia; it is

<sup>1</sup> Virgil's *infelix lolium*, 'unfruitful'. *Lolium* was bad for the eyes (Plaut. *Miles Gl.* 321 f., Ovid's *Fasti*, i 691). Darnel, when healthy, seems to be innocuous; but, when attacked by fungi, it is toxic, and (according to Hackel) 'produces confusion of sight'.

the oil-plant of India. It was unknown to the Hebrews, though the name derives from the Semitic *semsem*. Its cultivation is described by Columella. Hemp-seed (*cannabis*). Of Asiatic origin; its use as a fibre-plant was unknown to the Mediterranean nations. The Romans only grew it for its oily seeds, and Columella includes it among *legumina*.

87. The Romans distinguished from *frumenta* the field-crops (our leguminous plants), the seeds of which were contained in pods, or *siliquae*. Their cultivation was scarcely less ancient than that of cereals. Fabius, Piso, Lentulus and Cicero were *cognomina* of families, derived respectively from the Bean, the Pease, the Lentil, and the Chick-pea. Of these, the first three were all developed by cultivation from native plants. Virgil dwells on the advantage of alternating leguminous crops with others:—‘sic quoque mutatis requiescunt fetibus arua’; and the Romans were acquainted with the method of ‘green soiling’. Thus Pliny, ‘segetem stercorent fruges, lupinum, faba, uicia’. It is only in our own day that the explanation has been found in the property possessed by leguminous plants of fixing the nitrogen of the air.

Pulses.  
*Legumina.*

Field Bean (*faba*). ‘uere fabis satio’, Virg.; ‘laetum siliqua quassante legumen’, Virg. Pease (*pisum*); the poets disdain its mention. Lentil (*lens*) was carried to Egypt, where it was much improved by cultivation; (pease was not grown there); ‘nec Pelusiaca curam aspernabere lentis’, Virg. The lentil is not mentioned in Homer, which confirms its Italian origin. Chick-pea (*cicer*) probably came through Greece from Western Asia. The seeds were eaten roasted as they still are in Sicily; ‘fricti ciceris...emtor’, Hor. Calavance (*phaselus* and *phaseolus*) is mentioned once by Virgil, ‘uilemque phaselum’. Its usual identification with the Haricot is now abandoned, as that is ascertained to be of American origin. Recent research leaves no doubt that it was the ‘*fagiuolo dall’occhio*’ of the Italians, *Dolichos sinensis* of botanists; of Asiatic origin, now widely cultivated in all warm countries. Columella calls it ‘longa phaselus’ (hence δόλιχος), and describes its cultivation and the method of cooking the pods, which were eaten whole, ‘phaseoli uirides integri’, Col. Sir James Murray suggests that Calavance ultimately derives from ἐρέβινθος, which was a leguminous plant, almost certainly *cicer*. But as the Haricot, originally *fève turque* (cf. *gran turco* for ‘maize’), has now appropriated phaseolus, the transfer of another name, as in other cases, is not surprising. Vetch (*uicia*). Of native origin, ‘tenues fetus uiciae’, Virg., the small seeds of the vetch. Lupine (*lupinum*). Native. ‘tristis lupini . . siluam sonantem’, Virg., ‘the rattling haulm of the lupine’. Carob (*siliqua graeca*). A small tree, native of the Mediterranean region, ‘quam quidam κεράτιον vocant’, Col. Swine were fed on the pods, the ‘husks’ of the ‘prodigal son’. Hehn, however, thinks it improbable that Columella was speaking from his own knowledge, and that it was not grown in Italy at the time.

88. Lucerne (*mēdīca*). The Μηδική of Theophrastus and Dioscorides ; 'te quoque, medica, putres accipiunt sulci', Virg. Mistaking the name for *mēdīca*, mediaeval writers made it 'sanum faenum', and the French, 'sainfoin'—a name attached in England to a different plant. The modern name is of unascertained etymology but has no relation to that of the Swiss town. As the Spanish 'Alfalfa' (from Arabic), it is the mainstay of agriculture in warm temperate South America. Tree Medick (*cytīsus*). A native shrub, nearly related to lucerne. The flowers were sought by bees, 'cytiso saturantur apes', Virg., while the foliage was devoured by cattle, 'cytiso pastae distendent ubera uaccae', Virg. Vetchling (*lotus*). In agriculture any leguminous plant spontaneous in pastures, such as our Bird's Foot (*Lotus corniculatus*) and possibly Clover; 'lotosque frequentes', Virg. Fenugreek (*foenum graecum*). Probably of Asiatic origin: cultivated for spring fodder, but now little used except the seeds as a condiment in cattle food and in curry-powder.

89. The Romans used *pomum*, *malum* and *nux* in a general sense; *pomum* corresponds to our 'fruit'; *malum* was any fleshy tree-fruit, and the proverb *ab ovo usque ad mala*, from the beginning to the end, is 'from the *hors d'œuvre* to the dessert'; *nux* was any fruit with a hard shell.

Vine (*uitis*). Native South of the Caspian; in its wild form it reached the Mediterranean in the prehistoric age; this produces a scanty fruit, which the Sicilian peasants still call *labrusce*, as with Virgil:—*'siluestris raris sparsit labrusca racemis'*. The more generous cultivated kinds and the method of fermenting grape-juice came from Asia. From Syria they reached the Greeks who carried them to S. Italy. The word 'wine' in all its forms traces back to the Hebrew *váyin*. In poetry, and even in commerce, it became identified with nectar, the 'drink of the gods', *'uina novum fundam calathis Ariusia nectar'*, Virg. And it has been plausibly conjectured that the *Soma* of the Vedas may have been wine. By metonymy, the vine is sometimes called *Bacchus*, *'iuuat Ismara Baccho conserere'*, Virg. It was propagated by 'layers', *'propagine uites respondent'*, Virg., and planted in rows, *'canit effectos extremus uinitor antes'*, Virg. *Bumastus* is a variety with large clusters; *palmes* is a branch, *'turgent in palmite gemmae'*, Virg., *pampinus* a leafy shoot, *uua* a grape-bunch, *'defendit pampinus uuas'*, Virg. The Romans extended vine-cultivation into Western Europe and introduced it to Britain, with the Elm.

Olive (*olea*). Probably of African origin; it was known to the Greeks from the earliest times, *'oleaeque Minerua inuentrix'*, Virg., and only

<sup>1</sup> Hehn compares *uitis* with 'With', a plant with flexible stems, *'lentae uites'*, Virg. He supposes the name to have originally belonged to bryony and to have passed over to the vine. According to Livy Roman soldiers were punished *'uitibus'*. This, like 'supple-jack', need not mean a particular plant, but any suitable for the purpose. 'Vine' in English has been extended to other climbing plants.

later to the Romans. There were various cultivated races:—‘orchades et radii et amara pausia bacca’, Virg., a round, a long, and a bitter-berried sort. These could only be perpetuated by cuttings, ‘truncis oleae melius respondent’, Virgil, who also notices its slow growth, ‘prolem tarde crescentis’, and pallid foliage, ‘pallentis foliis oliuae’. The passage ‘flauaque caput nectentur oliua’ refers to the copious yellow pollen which it sheds in flower. Ten varieties are distinguished by Columella. Wild Olive (*oleaster*) comes up from seed and is useless, ‘infelix superat foliis oleaster amaris’, Virg.; it is eaten by goats, ‘oleaster . . . iuuat . . . capellas’, Lucr.

Pomegranate (*Punica mālus*) came to the Mediterranean from W. Asia, and to Italy from Carthage, whence its name. The leathery rind of the fruit encloses a mass of seeds enveloped in red pulp; ‘punica sub lento cortice grana rubent’, Ov., ‘quae rutilo mitescit tegmine’, Col. Hence the name *malum granatum*, said to be perpetuated in ‘Granada’. βαλαύστιον, the *balaustium* of Columella and Pliny, was the flower of the pomegranate, and has given us the words ‘balustrade’ and ‘banister’. Quince (*mālum aureum*, also ‘*hesperidum mala*’, Virg.). Native of W. Asia, first cultivated in Europe in Crete; hence its Greek name κυδώνιον, whence ‘quince’ is ultimately derived. It was sacred to Venus and the emblem of happiness. It is the ‘apple’ of the Canticles and was smelt as a restorative, like the mediaeval ‘pomander’.

Fig (*ficus*), a native of the Eastern and Southern shores of the Mediterranean. Greek colonists took it to S. Italy. It could not, however, have been common when Cato produced to the Roman Senate a ripe fig from Carthage to show the nearness of the enemy. With Horace the ripening of the fruit marks the beginning of autumn, ‘dum ficus prima calorque’. The wood was worthless; Horace makes a wooden statue say:—‘olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum’. Dried figs (*caricae*), as the name implies, were imported from S.W. Asia Minor, as they still are from Smyrna: ‘rugosae carica’, Ov. ‘the shrivelled fig’. Wild Fig (*caprificus*). The fig has two sexes, and, to produce abundant fruit on the cultivated kinds, the branches of the wild fig had to be hung upon the trees. It became naturalised on rocks and ruins, ‘sepulcris caprificos erutas’, Hor., ‘ad quae discutienda ualent sterilis mala robora ficus’, Juv. Black Mulberry (*morus*). Native South of the Caspian, but found its way to Syria in Biblical times. Ovid makes the colour of the fruit originate in the blood of Pyramus, who killed himself under a white mulberry; hence perhaps Virgil’s ‘sanguineis moris’. But this is legendary, as the white mulberry did not reach Europe till the Middle Ages. Horace thought the man would do well, ‘qui nigris prandia moris finiet’. Virgil commemorates the curious belief of his time that silk, which reached Italy probably through Persia, was the down stripped from the underside of leaves, ‘uelleraque ut foliis depectant tenuia Seres’ (*Georg.* ii 121). Hence St Aldhelm writes:—‘nec crocea Seres texunt lanugine



uermes', and Fletcher, *Purple Island*, xii 3, 'No Serean worms he knows, that with their threads | Draw out their silken lives'. Pear (*pirus*). Native of Europe, but required a warmer climate than the apple. The wild form (*achras*) is spiny, '(terra) aspera siluis achradis'; cultural improvement began in the earliest times; Virgil recognises distinct kinds:—'nec surculus idem | Crustumis, Syriisque piris, grauibusque uolemis'. These were perpetuated by grafting, 'insere nunc, Meliboe, piros', Virg. The 'Syrian' pears were also called Tarentine, and have been conjectured to be the Bergamot. Hehn equates *pirum* (the fruit) with *ἄπιον*. The 'uolemum' has been identified with the Bon-Chrétien. Apple (*mālus*). Native of the Southern shores of the Black Sea, it became naturalised in the Mediterranean region in prehistoric times, and thence spread over Europe; but the Italian climate is too hot for it. Virgil speaks of grafting it on the pear, 'mutatamque insita mala ferre pirum'. Schrader follows Stokes doubtfully in suggesting that the North European names of the apple come from Abella in Campania, Virgil's 'maliferae moenia Abellae'. But it is by no means clear that, though fruitful, it was an apple-producing country. The *mala Appiana* mentioned by Pliny owe their name to Appius Claudius, who appears to have invented the practice of grafting the apple on the quince-stock, a practice still in use; the name has come down in French as *pomme d'api*. Service-tree (*sorbus*). A tree of S. Europe producing an austere fruit (*sorbum*), inedible till bletted, 'sorba sumus, molles nimium tendentia uentres', Mart. A sort of perry seems to have been made from it, 'pocula . . . acidis imitantur uitea sorbis', Virg. Plum (*prunus*); came from Asia Minor. Virgil's 'cerea pruna', Ovid's 'generosa, nouasque imitantia ceras' and Columella's 'pruna cereola', were a yellow sort; 'spinas iam pruna ferentes', Virg., is possibly the Bullace, while the difficult passage, 'sepibus in nostris . . . roscida mala' has been conjectured to refer to the Sloe. Columella's 'pruna Damasci' and Martial's 'pruna damascena' were Damsons. Apricot, in old English, 'apricock' (*praecoqua*). A native of N.W. India, much cultivated in Armenia, whence it found its way to Rome. Columella, who first mentions it, calls it *Armenium*. Martial's epigram is suggestive:—'uilia maternis fuereamus praecoqua ramis; nunc in adoptiuis Persica cara sumus', 'seedlings were worthless, but, grafted, bore high-priced peaches.' Cherry (*cerasus*). Appears to be indigenous to NE. Asia Minor, whence it was carried to Greece and thence into Italy. The fruits are poor and were apparently called *corna*, as may be inferred from Virgil's statement that it was grafted on a plum-stock, 'prunis lapidosa rubescere corna'. Lucullus brought a fine kind from Pontus. The Cherry is supposed to have taken its name from Kerasous, but with more probability gave it to the town. Cornelian Cherry (*cornus*). A small tree, native of S. Europe, occurring sparingly in N. Italy. The name seems to connect with *cornu*, as *κερασός* with *κέρας*. Both refer to the horn-like toughness of its heart-wood, which was used for spear-shafts,

'bona bello cornus', Virg., which is, however, possibly a reminiscence of the Homeric use. The fruit superficially resembles the wild cherry and both were included under *corna*. Citron (*mālus Mēdica*). The Citron and

Lemon, natives of Western India, did not find their way (through Media) to cultivation in Mediterranean countries till post-classical times. But the fruits of the Citron (perhaps with leaves attached) were brought by trade-routes, just as at the present day they are exported from Morocco for the Jewish Feast of Tabernacles. They were used to protect clothes from moth. The fragrant wood of the Sandarach-tree (*Callitris quadrivalvis*) from North Africa was used for the same purpose. Popular belief accepting the fruit as belonging to it, called it Citrus, corrupted from Cedrus (κέδρος), primarily any fragrant coniferous wood, but restricted by the Romans to the native prickly juniper. A citron-wood table, 'mensa citrea', Mart., was highly prized, 'Atlantica munera . . . , aurea qui dederit dona, minora dabit', Mart. When the confusion was discovered, Citron-wood was called by its Greek name *θύια* (the thylene wood of Revelation), by the educated, 'thyiae thalamo effultum', Prop. But the vulgar error has come down to our own day in the name of the fruit. Virgil, wishing to contrast the East with the West, borrows from Theophrastus his description of the Citron-tree as a product of the former:—'*Media fert tristes succos tardumque saporem | felicitis mali*', where '*tristes*' is biting, and '*tardum saporem*' implies that the taste lingers long on the palate. Virgil calls it '*felix*', because it remedied impure breath, and, like the Quince, was a restorative:—'*animas et olentia Medi | ora fouent illo, et senibus medicantur anhelis*'. Jujubes (*tuberes*); the fruit of the African *zizyphus*, a name of which middle-Latin *jujuba*, French *jujube*, is a corruption. The Romans cultivated it, and there was a seedless form, *apyrina*, a product of cultivation, '*lecta suburbanis mittuntur apyrina ramis | et uernae tuberes: quid tibi cum Libycis?*', Mart.

90. Chestnut (*castanea*). The original home of the Chestnut is in doubt, and can scarcely now be ascertained. It forms woods through the whole Mediterranean region from Pontus westward. That it was a late introduction is inferred from neither Greeks nor Romans having any name for the fruit. Virgil is the first to speak of it as '*castaneae nuces*'. In modern times it plays, in the Apennines and Corsica, the part of the potato in Ireland, and with the same result. Walnut (*nux*); in prose *inglans* (*Iouis glans*). It found its western natural limit in Greece, but was early introduced into Italy. Virgil's '*ramos curuabit olentes*' marks the acrid smell of the foliage. The nuts were thrown at weddings, '*sparge marite nuces*', Virg., as, according to Pliny, they made the maximum of noise. '*nucibus relictis*', Pers., implied putting away childish things: '*da nuces pueris iners*', Cat. The green rind enclosing the nut contains a dye used to darken the hair, '*coma tum mutatur, ut annos | dissimulet uiridi cortice tincta nucis*', Tib. Almond (*nux graeca*); a native of Western Asia, cultivated in biblical times

Nuts.  
Nuces.

in Syria; has spread westward through the whole Mediterranean region. Virgil makes no mention of it. Ovid has 'nec amygdala desunt', but the earlier name implies that the nuts were imported from Greece. Peach (*persicum*); a native of China, only reached the Mediterranean comparatively late through Persia; 'gentis de nomine dicta | exiguc properant mitescere Persica malo', Col.; he adds, 'quae maxima Gallia donat', where Galatia would have been more probable. Virgil's 'cana . . . tenera lanugine mala' may possibly refer to it. Martial speaks of its being grafted on the Apricot in an epigram, the *lemma* of which is *persica* or *persica praecoqua* in the best MSS, and *nucipersica* in others. In the Middle Ages the latter name was identified with the nectarine (which is a variety of the peach) on account of its resemblance when unripe to the fruit of the walnut. The nectarine is still known as *nocepesca* by the Italians. Confusion long existed between *persea* and *persica*, which was supposed to have been poisonous in Persia, but to have become harmless when carried to Egypt. Thus Columella:—'quae barbara Persis | miserat, ut fama est, patriis armata uenenis.—at nunc... | ambrosios praebent succos oblita nocendi.' This story, repeated by Dioscorides, is rejected by Pliny, who also distinguishes *persea* (an Abyssinian tree, *Mimusops Schimperi*, formerly cultivated in Egypt) and derives the name from Perseus, who planted it at Memphis, where Alexander was crowned with it in compliment to his Jovine descent. Sebesten (*myxa*); a small Asiatic tree ranging from China to Egypt. It bears a small plum-like fruit (*myxum*) with a mucilaginous pulp (Hehn compares the name with 'mucus'). Hazel (*corylus*); indigenous, but its fruit is not noticed. Its spreading roots were injurious to the vines, 'neue inter uites corylum sere,' Virg., and, as both it and the goat were enemies to its culture, the entrails of the one were to be roasted on spits of the other, 'in uerubus torrebimus exta columinis', Virg. The fine variety known as the Filbert originated in Pontus, hence *nux pontica*. It was carried from Greece to Campania, and Abella, Virgil's 'maliferae moenia Abellae', gave it the name of 'nux abellana'.

The few native fruits remain to be noticed. Virgil knew the Bramble (*rubus asper*), the Strawberry, 'humi nascentia fraga', and the mawkish fruit of the Arbutus, 'dant arbuta siluae'; the tree was more useful for feeding goats, 'iubeo frondentia capris | arbuta sufficere', Virg. These Ovid tells us were, with wild cherries and acorns, the slender produce of native fruits which Italy could supply in the Golden, *i.e.* the prehistoric, Age:—'arbuteos fetus, montanaque fraga legebant | cornaque, et in duris haerentia mora rubetis | et quae deciderant patula Iouis arbore glandes'.

91. While the West drew its 'fruits' mainly from the East, its Pot-herbs. 'vegetables', a more imperious necessity, were mostly Olera. improved forms of native plants.

Cabbage (*brassica*), in all its forms, was developed by cultivation from the wild plants native to the European shores; never popular with Southern, it found more favour with Northern races; Juvenal's *crambe repetita* has

become a proverb for intolerable iteration. *Brassica* was the leafy 'head', which seems to have been tied up like our lettuces, 'iunco brassica uincta leui', Prop. Martial recommends boiling with nitre to keep the colour, 'nitrata uiridis brassica fiat aqua'; 'nigra coliculus uirens patella', Mart. *Caulis* was the leafy shoot (our Kale); 'qui teneros caules alieni frerigit horti', Hor.; 'ualido . . . lurida caule | brassica', Col. Turnip (*rapum*, *rapulum*) was probably little developed from the wild stock, and, as with other still unameliorated plants, was first valued for its pungency, like our horse-radish; 'acria circum | rapula, lactucae, radices, qualia lassum | peruellunt stomachum, siser', Hor. Turnips were flung as an insult, a practice still occasionally in vogue, 'Hadrumeti seditione quadam rapa in eum iacta sunt', Suet. Navev (*nāpus*) is allied to the turnip but requires the warmth of a continental climate. Martial speaks of the Sabine turnips (*Nursicas pilas*) contemptuously in comparison. Charlock (*rapistri olus*, Col., or *lapsana*). Pliny gives the proverb 'lapsana uiuere', to live sparingly, cp. *urtica*. 'Horse-radish' (*armöräcía*) is noticed by Columella. Parsnip (*siser*); native; the identification is possible but conjectural. Carrot (*pastināca*); a native plant improved by cultivation, as noticed by Columella:—'agrestis pastinaca et eiusdem nominis edomita quam Graeci σταφυλῖνον uocant'. Later it was called *carota*, and *pastinaca* (from *pastinum*) transferred to the parsnip, which derives its name from it. Skirret, a native of W. Asia from Siberia to Persia, whence it reached Europe. Columella distinguishes it from *siser* (with which it has been identified) as 'Assyrioque uenit quae semine radix'. The Parsnip, the Carrot and the Skirret were all edible roots of umbelliferous plants. It would be quite in accordance with Roman custom to speak of them indifferently under the same name (*siser*). Chervil. 'breue *chaerephyllum*', Col. Radish (*radix*, Fr. *radis*); of W. Asian origin, it brought its Greek name (*raphanus*) to Italy; the Romans grew the large winter kind. Rocket (*erūca*); native; now only used on the Continent as a salad; 'erucas salaces', Ov., 'herba salax', Mart. Horace makes Nasidienus the first to use it in cooking the *muraena*, 'erucas uirides, inulas ego primus amaras | monstrui incoquere'. Cress (*nasturtium*) came from Persia, where, as with us now, Xenophon says it was eaten with bread. It was afterwards called Cardamum. The name (*a narium tormento*) is now popularly given to 'Indian Cress', a wholly different S. American plant. Beet (*beta*), native to the Mediterranean shores, was developed by cultivation; 'languidior tenera . . . beta', Cat.; Martial calls it the insipid food of artisans, 'ut sapiant fatuae fabrorum prandia betae'. Leaf-beet (*cicla*, i.e. *sicula*): a cultivated form of which the white stalks of the leaves were eaten, 'folio uiridis, pede candida beta', Col. Lettuce (*lactuca*), like endive, was developed from a wild Mediterranean stock. While still unimproved, both were the 'bitter herbs' or the Passover. 'Claudere quae cenas lactuca solebat aurorum, | dic mihi, cur nostras inchoat illa dapes', Mart. Endive (*intubum*); 'amaris



intuba fibris' (Virg.) refers to the roots: Chicory (*cichōrēum*); a race which has developed in a different direction. Cardoon (*cinara*); a native of the Mediterranean shores, of which the artichoke is a modern cultural development. Introduced into S. America it has run wild on an enormous scale and forms impenetrable thickets in La Plata. The Romans could only eat the 'receptacle' which carries the flowers (*fond d'artichaut*). Columella gives a fine description of the plant in the manner of Virgil and not unworthy of his master:—

'haec modo purpureo surgit glomerata corymbo...  
nunc adaperta manet, nunc pinea uertice pungit,  
nunc similis calathō, spinisque minantibus horret,  
pallida nonnumquam tortos imitatur acanthos'.

Elecampane (*inula*); a native of Southern Europe; the root was long valued as a tonic; 'rapula plenus | atque acidus mauult inulas', Hor., 'sharp-tasting'. Now only used as an ingredient in *absinthe*. Celery (*apium*); a semi-aquatic native plant improved by cultivation. The Romans only grew it for its foliage, used in garlands, 'nectendis apium coronis', Hor. Columella says, 'praecipue aqua laetatur, et ideo secundum fontem commodissime ponitur'. Sorrel (*lapathum*). Native; 'lapathi brevis herba', Hor. 'lubrica lapathos', Col., 'slimy' aptly describes it when cooked. Purslain<sup>1</sup> (*andrachne*). Of W. Asian origin, 'humidaque andrachne sitientes protegit antes', Col. Mallow (*malua*). Native from the Mediterranean northwards. Martial mentions it as an aid to digestion, 'exoneraturas uentrem...maluas'. Orach (*atriplex*). Native of N. Asia; 'olus atriplicis quod Graeci uocant ἀτράραξιν', Col. Asparagus (*asparagus*). Native in the Mediterranean region: 'montani asparagi... quos legit uilica', Juv. *Corruda*, mentioned by Columella, 'asparagi corruda simillima filo', was another native species which has not passed into cultivation. Onion (*caepa*). Native of W. Asia to Syria, whence it reached Greece and Italy in early times: 'lacrimosa caepa', Col. Ovid calls it *bulbus* and mentions various cultivated sorts. It was much cultivated for food in Egypt, as still, but was held sacred by the priests, according to Juvenal, 'porrum et caepe nefas uiolare et frangere morsu'; he ridicules their 'in hortis numina', as does Horace, 'seu porrum et cepe trucidas'. Ovid plays on the words *caput* and *cepa*:—'caede caput, dixit. cui rex, parebimus, inquit: | caedenda est hortis eruta cepa meis'. Shallot (*ascalonia caepa*). A cultivated variety of the onion, probably of Asiatic origin, 'capita maxima generis Ascalonii, quod est optimum', Col. Garlic (*allium*); of Asiatic origin, it reached Europe in prehistoric times. The use of alliaceous plants is almost a distinguishing mark of Mediterranean nations. Garlic was regarded as a restorative; thus Virgil, 'fessis messoribus... allia... contundit'. Horace calls it 'cicutis allium nocentius', and exclaims, 'O dura messorum ilia'. Leek (*porrum capitatum*). Of Eastern origin, much developed by cultivation in Egypt.

<sup>1</sup> Derived from *porcillāca* (Plin. xx 210).

The best were those of Aricia, 'mater Aricia porri', Col., described by Martial, 'in niueo uirides stipite cerne comas'. Like Columella he recognises two kinds, 'utrumque porrum', according as grown for root or leaves. Martial speaks of *porrum sectile*, because the leaves are cut ('demetitur', Col.), leaving the roots in the ground. He gives the prudent advice:—'*fila Tarentini grauius redolentia porri | edisti quoties, oscula clausa dato*', where *fila* are the shredded leaves. Culcas (*colocasia*); of Indian origin (*Colocasia anti-quorum* of botanists), cultivated for ornament in our gardens as *Caladium*; still grown in Egypt, where its introduction was of no great antiquity. '*mixtaque ridenti colocasia fundet acantho*', Virg. The root was eaten: Martial does no injustice to its merits; it was at once woolly and stringy:—'*Niliacum ridebis olus, lanasque sequaces, | improba cum morsu fila manuque trahes*'. Cucumber (*cucumis*), a native of Northern India, came to Italy through Greece; '*tortumque per herbam cresceret in uentrem cucumis*', Virg. Columella says that, by growing them in *specularia*, Tiberius had cucumbers all the year round. The Water-Melon, of African origin and cultivated in Egypt, is not improbably the '*caeruleus cucumis*' of Propertius and the '*Alexandrinae cucurbitae*' of Columella. The Melon itself was unknown to the Romans. Pumpkin (*cucurbita*); of African origin; '*tumidoque cucurbita uentre*', Prop. Columella mentions several varieties. Martial describes what a clever cook can do with a gourd, '*Atreus.....cucurbitarum, | sic illas... | in partes lacerat secatque mille*'. Columella also mentions:—Alexanders (*olus atrum*), a native of Europe and N. Africa, and Lovage (*ligusticum*), a S. European plant; corrupted into the late Lat. *leuisticum* (whence lovage).

92. Mushrooms (*fungi*), though found wild, must find a place here. Horace's advice is sound:—'*pratensibus optima fungis | natura est; aliis male creditur*'. Toadstool (*boletus*). Mushrooms.  
*Fungi.* The *Boletus edulis* is more esteemed in France than in England. The Romans highly appreciated it; '*boletos mittere difficile est*', says Martial, because you do not like to part with them. So Juvenal:—'*uilibus ancipites fungi ponentur amicis, | boletus domino*'. The '*boletus*' with which Agrippina poisoned Claudius was the Fly Agaric. Martial says of a glutton, '*boletum, qualem Claudius edit, edat*'. Nero, who benefited by the crime, called the *boletus* the food of the Gods, '*ad ἀποθέωσιν Claudii respiciens*'. Truffle (*tuber*). Martial clearly describes it:—'*rumpimus altricem tenero quae uertice terram | tubera, boletis poma secunda sumus*'. The best came from Africa, '*Libye...dum tubera mittas*', Juv. They were peeled for eating, '*qui radere tubera terrae, | boletum condire...didicit*', Juv.

93. Caper (*capparis*). A Mediterranean plant, still used for seasoning. '*capparin et putri cepas allece natantes, ... uoras*', Mart. Peppermint (*mentha*). European; a cordial, Seasonings.  
Condimenta. '*menta ructatrix*' Mart.; '*olentes menthas*', Ov. Savory (*satureia*), a native of Southern Europe, allied to Mint, Thyme and

Marjoram; 'et satureia thymi referens thymbraeque saporem', Col. Martial calls it *improba*. 'herbas, satureia, nocentes sumere', Ov. Rue (*ruta*). European, used for garnishing dishes, 'rutae frondibus oua tegant', Mart.; for flavouring, 'ut condat uario uaser sapore | in rutae folium Capelliana', Mart.; for an eye-wash, 'acuentes lumina rutas', Ov.; compare Milton, 'purg'd with Euphrasie and Rue | the visual nerve'. Sweet Marjoram (*amaracus*); native of N. Africa; a coronary plant; 'cinge tempora floribus | suaueolentis amaraci', Cat.; used for an unguent, the smell was disliked by swine:—'amaracinum fugitat sus | quod nos interdum tamquam recreare uidetur', Lucr. Cummin (*cuminum*). Mediterranean; its use as a spice perhaps originated with the Hebrews. The Roman poets attribute to it the property of producing pallor. Thus Horace, of servile imitators:—'quod si pallerem casu, biberent exsanguine cuminum'; and Persius, 'pallentis grana cumini'. It gives its name to the German liqueur *Kümmel*, which, however, owes its flavour to Caraway. Dill (*anethum*). Mediterranean; 'florem iungit bene olentis anethi', Virg. Fennel (*faeniculum* or *feniculum*). Native. 'substernere...feniculum', Col. Mustard (*sinapi* or *sinapis*, *ῥάπυ*). Native. 'seque lacesanti fletum factura sinapis', Col. Columella also mentions:—Anise (*anisum aegyptium*). Of Asiatic origin; the biblical plant was dill. Caraway (*carcum*). Native. Samphire (*batis*, *olus cordum*). Native. Coriander (*coriandrum*), probably of W. Asiatic origin; the 'seeds' were used as a stomachic.

94. Virgil gives a well-known description of a Roman garden. It

Garden-plants.

*Hortensiae*.

was an enclosure of small extent with elms, limes and planes for shade. Flowering plants, of which the choice was limited, and others, were grown for ornament and to supply the bees, and it provided fruit and vegetables for the table.

Rose (*rosa*). (1) The Cabbage Rose came from Persia, and the Provins Rose from the Caucasus; both reached Italy through Greece. The practice of wearing rose-wreaths was borrowed from the East. Horace complains:—'Persicos odi, puer, apparatus, | displicent nexae philyra coronae, | mitte sectari, rosa quo locorum, | sera moretur'; the rose was the latest of the spring flowers. Roses were strewn at feasts, 'sparge rosas', Hor. (2) Damask Rose (*rosa bifera*). Native of W. Asia. The Rose-gardens of Paestum are celebrated by the poets. Thus Propertius:—'uidi ego odorati uictura rosaria Paesti | sub matutino cocta iacere Noto'. We may conclude that they were the objects of careful and skilful cultivation. Both Virgil and Martial speak of the rose flowering in them twice a year, 'biferique rosaria Paesti'. This has perplexed the commentators, as all kinds, except the China Rose, which did not reach Europe till the 16th century, flower only once. The Damask Rose, however, appears to prolong its flowering with an interval, and in this sense may be said to flower twice. It is cultivated in Eastern Europe for the production of *attar*. It was probably introduced into S. Italy from Syria. Roses were sent to Domitian in winter from Egypt:—'Nilotica tellus | miserat hibernas ambitiosa

rosas'; Martial however thought that Paestum could hold its own, 'tantaque Paestani gloria ruris erat' (§ 14). White Lily (*lilium*), of W. Asiatic origin, was naturalised in Greece and Italy; Virgil's *grandia lilia* can mean nothing else. Its bloom is short, *breue lilium*, Hor. In such passages as Petronius, 'albaque de uiridi riserunt lilia prato', *lilia* seems to be used of wild liliaceous plants generally, such as Star of Bethlehem. Poet's narcissus (*narcissus*). Native. Virgil's 'purpureo narcisso' refers to the purple rim of the nectary of the white flower. It was supposed to contain the tears of Narcissus. Compare Milton, 'Daffodillies fill their cups with tears'. Vervain (*uerbena*) extends from the Mediterranean throughout Europe on the one hand, and to the Himalaya on the other. The fame of this unattractive plant is unaccountable. There is a continuous tradition from its ceremonial use in classical times to its superstitious employment amongst Teutonic races to-day. 'uerbenasque premens', i.e. 'planting vervain', Virg. Altars were decked with it, 'ara castis uincta uerbenis', Hor.; and it was used in sacrifice, 'uerbenas, pueri, ponite, thuraque', Hor. An ambassador of peace, *uerbenarius*, carried an uprooted plant in his hand. But, as commonly happens in ceremonial usage, while the rite remained, the symbol was replaced by a substitute; thus *uerbenae* came to mean merely sacred boughs. Bear's foot (*acanthus*). Native: another species with spinous leaves (whence the name) is only Greek. The Romans planted *Acanthus mollis* along their garden walks and kept it trimmed; 'acanthi...crepidines marginum uestientis', Plin. The reference in 'flexi...uimen acanthi', Virg., seems to be to the supposed invention by Callimachus of the Corinthian capital, which is, however, mythical, as it was anticipated in Assyrian architecture. Virgil, borrowing from Theocritus, speaks of cups with *acanthus* twisted round the handles:— 'et molli circum est ansas amplexus acantho'. The name was also applied to a thorny tree (the Egyptian *Acacia arabica*), as in 'baccas semper frondentis acanthi', where *bacca* is used of anything berry-shaped, and stands for the yellow flower-heads. Hence, 'pictum croceo uelamen acantho', Virg. The tree furnished the 'shittim wood' of Scripture, a name corrupted from the Arabic *sant* which is still in use. Garlands made of the flower-heads (Theophr. *Hist. Pl.* iv 2, 8) have been found in Egyptian tombs.

Egyptian Bean (*ciborium*). Native of Egypt. *κιβώριον* was primarily the funnel-shaped seed-receptacle of *Nelumbium speciosum*; thence applied to the whole plant. The leaves, shaped like a shallow dish, were used for drinking, and gave the name to a cup:— 'ciboria exple', Hor. In post-classical times, for a similar reason, the name was transferred to various articles of church furniture.

Date Palm (*palma*). The Date (*φοῖνξ*, the Phoenician tree) must find its place here, as it was only cultivated for ornament. Of Babylonian origin, it spread westward, 'Idumaeas palmas', Virg., but does not ripen its fruit on the northern side of the Mediterranean. Date-wine doubtless



explains the myth of the Lotophagi. Virgil calls the Date-palm *ardua*, lofty. It was the badge of victory, 'quos Elea domum reducit | palma caelestes', Hor.; the leaves were also used as brooms, 'lapides uarios lutulenta radere palma', Hor. The 'date' (*i.e.* the fruit, which was imported) is sometimes called *palma* by the poets, 'cum pipere et palmis', Pers. *Palma* includes the native Mediterranean fan-palm (*Chamaerops*, 'ground-palm'), which is abundant in Sicily; 'palmosa Selinus', Virg.

95. Monkshood (*aconitum*). European; a poison:—'clamat Pontia feci, | confiteor, puerisque meis aconita parauit', Juv.; 'lurida terribiles miscent aconita nouæcae', Ov. Sometimes, as in our own day, its effects were accidental:—'neu miseros fallunt aconita legentes', Virg., the context implying that it does not grow in Italy; nor does it, except in the cooler parts. White Hellebore (*ueratrum*). Native; 'ueratrum est acre uenenum', Lucr., 'ebria ueratro', Pers. *Carpasa*, 'elleboros et noxia carpasa succo', Col., or *carbasa*, sometimes held to be the plural of *carbasus*, with which it can have nothing to do. It is the 'sucus carpathi' of Pliny, and derived its name from the island of Carpathus, the modern Scarpanto. No classical writer has attempted to identify the plant producing it. All that is known is that it was mixed with myrrh<sup>1</sup>, was a poison, 'epotus carpasi succus soporem citamque strangulationem adducit'<sup>2</sup>, and that the remedies were the same as for hemlock. The effects agree with those produced by White Hellebore (*ueratrum*), and this identification is confirmed by the late Greek name for Hellebore, καρπύον, and σκάρφη the modern, where σ is prefixed as in Skarpanto. Black Hellebore (*helleborus*). Native; the Christmas Rose of our gardens; 'elleborosque graues', Virg., referring to its acrid taste. In classical times it was a remedy for mental disease, especially melancholia, 'danda est ellebori multo pars maxima auaris, | nescio an Anticyram ratio illis destinet omnem', Hor.; the best came from Anticyra in Phocis. It is now only used in cattle medicine. Mandrake (*mandragora*). Native of the Mediterranean region. Magical properties were attributed to it from Biblical times, and the forked roots roughly resembling the human figure are still used in the East as charms, '(terra) semihominis uesano gramine feta | mandragorae pariat flores', Col. Southern-wood (*abrotonon*). Native country uncertain, possibly Spain; 'abrotonum aegro | non audet, nisi qui didicist, dare', Hor. Wormwood (*absinthium*). European; 'tetra absinthi natura ferique | centauri foedo pertorquent ora sapore', Lucr. The principal ingredient in *absinthe*. Pellitory root (*pyrethrum*). Native of N. Africa; 'tritaque in annoso flaua pyrethra mero', Ov.; used as a stimulant; in modern times for tooth-ache. Dittany of Crete (*dictamnus*). Found only in Crete; 'dictamnus genitrix Cretaea carpit ab Ida', Virg. This is one of the plants of which

<sup>1</sup> But there is clearly a confusion with an adulterant of myrrh, ὀποκάρπασον, said to be poisonous.

<sup>2</sup> Lat. trans. of Pseudo-Dioscorides, *De Venenis*, c. 13.

Virgil gives almost a technical description. Used as a febrifuge, and though in high repute through the Middle Ages, it is now reduced to an ingredient in *absinthe*. Squill (*scilla*). Mediterranean; merely mentioned by Virgil with Hellebore; one of the most ancient of medicines; still in use.

Hemlock (*cicuta*). Native of Europe and temperate Asia. A poison; 'male tollet anum uitiat melle cicuta', Hor.; 'homini quae est acre uenenum', Lucr.; 'maestamque cicutam', Col. The dry hollow stems were used for the deeper pan-pipes, 'disparibus septem compacta cicutis fistula', Virg., 'cauas inflare cicutas', Lucr.

Virgil's 'Sardonis ... amarior herbis' (the *Sardonia herba* of later writers) has perplexed the commentators, but was probably some acrid Crowfoot. The facial distortion it produced, '*risus sardonius*', has become proverbial as 'Sardonic laughter'. But this is only a late Latin Euhemeristic explanation of the Homeric *σαρδάνιον*, which had nothing to do with Sardinia, 'rideamus γέλωτα Σαρδάνιον', Cic. Virgil's 'fallax herba ueneni occidet' almost certainly points to the poisonous Water Dropwort, which may be mistaken for wild celery.

96. Saffron (*crocus*), a native of S. Europe from Italy eastwards and W. Asia. The yellow dye-stuff is obtained from the styles and stigmata. Corycian saffron was the best, 'Corycioque croco

Dyes.

sparsum', Hor. It was sprinkled in theatres as a scent, 'cum scena croco Cilici perfusa recens est', Lucr.; and an ingredient in unguents, 'effuso permaduisse croco', Mart. Kermes (*coccum*), the female *coccus* of the Kermes oak, native of the northern shores of the Mediterranean; used to dye crimson; 'rubro ubi cocco | tincta super lectos canderet uestis eburnos', Hor.; cp. Cochineal, which has displaced it. Litmus (*fucus*), a cosmopolitan rock-lichen: 'neque amissos colores lana refert medicata fuco', Hor. Virgil uses it in the sense of bee-glue (*propolis*), the reddish substance with which bees stop up the openings of their hives, 'cera spiramenta linunt fucoque'. Weld (*lutum*). Native; 'croceo mutabit uellera luto', Virg.

97. Stinging Nettle (*urtica*). Native, used from the earliest times as a stimulant, 'me recurui...urtica', Cat. The young shoots are still eaten in England by peasants; 'abstemius, herbis uiuis et urtica', Hor., of the most frugal diet. The stinging nettle was the only fibre-plant used in prehistoric Europe, and it is still in use in Western Asia. Hehn points out the etymological affinity of 'net' and 'nettle', and Sir James Murray holds that this connexion is, according to the latest research, 'formally possible, and, from the sense, probable'. In later times the use of the 'nettle' gave way to that of flax.

Fibre-plants.

Flax (*linum*). The primitive inhabitants of Europe cultivated the indigenous perennial flax, the use of which was early supplanted by the W. Asian annual plant. The manufacture of linen (*linteum*) in Syria and Egypt goes back to the remotest antiquity. Egyptian mummies were swathed in it<sup>1</sup>, and it was used for priestly garments, 'uelati lino et

<sup>1</sup> Herodotus, ii 86, σινδόνης βυσσίνης.

uerbena tempora cincti', Virg., a use which has descended to our own time. The cultivation never established itself in Italy, as it did later in N. Europe. What was grown was for the oily seed, and Virgil notes its well-known exhausting effect, 'urit campum lini seges'. It was used, however, for nets (Juvenal calls a fisherman 'lini magister'), and for the sealed threads with which documents and letters were fastened, 'epistolam soluere, linum incidere', Cic. Linen was imported: that from Spain was called *Carbasus*, a word which is identical with *Karpāsa*, the Sanskrit name for the cotton-plant. It was used for the awnings of theatres, 'carbasus ut quondam magnis intenta theatris dat crepitum', Lucr.; 'carbasa lina', Prop., were linen garments.

Cotton (*Aethiopum lana*). African Cotton (*Gossypium arboreum*) is native in Abyssinia and widely grown in Africa, but not used commercially. If cultivated later in Lower Egypt, it was soon displaced by the Indian plant (*G. herbaceum*) introduced by the Arabs with its Arabic name *qutun*; at first probably used for stuffing rather than a textile. The English name Acton means 'a jacket quilted with cotton'. In the 18th century cotton was carried to the New World, which now strives for the monopoly of its production. The cultivation of the Indian cotton-plant had in early times extended to Persia; and the expedition of Alexander made the Greeks acquainted with cotton-cloth. Muslin (from Mosul) was probably known to the Hebrews, and so may have entered into Mediterranean trade. It may also have been brought with pepper from the Malabar coast; (from Calicut, on the same coast, we have 'calico'). But the transference of its name to the fine linen of Spain is a proof that it was in little use. One might hazard the suggestion that Virgil had an oriental muslin in his mind when he wrote, 'tenuis glauco uelabat amictu carbasus'<sup>1</sup>. The Romans probably knew no more of the material of cotton-cloth than they did of silk, and though Virgil knew of African cotton, 'nemora Aethiopum molli canentia lana', he probably regarded it as *Baum-wolle*. Marsh-mallow (*hibiscus*). A native fibrous plant, 'gracili fiscellam contextit hibisco', Virg.

98. Pole-reed (*canna*). *Arundo Donax*, of W. Asiatic origin, early introduced into Mediterranean countries; the Reed of the Reeds, etc. Bible, Hebr. *kaneh*, whence the Greek and Roman names, and the English 'cane' (now applied to a different Malayan plant) and 'cannon'. Ovid distinguishes it as 'canna palustris' from the almost cosmopolitan common reed, which he calls poetically 'steriles uluae'. Horace names it *arundo longa*, 'equitare in arundine longa' (a hobby-horse). Other writers adopt the Greek equivalent of *arundo*, *calamus*, but usually in the sense of something made of it, as pens, of which the best were imported, a proof that the plant was little grown in Italy at the time. Thus Martial:—'dat chartis habiles calamos Memphis tellus; | texantur

<sup>1</sup> Virgil may, however, have had in mind the description of the oriental cotton-plant in Theophrastus, *Hist. Plant.* iv 5, τὰ ἐπιφώρα, καὶ τὸ ἐπίον ἐξ οὗ τὰς σινδόνας ὑφαίνουσι.

reliqua tecta palude tibi'. 'Egyptian reeds will make you good pens; your own you may use for thatching'. Reed (*arundo*), generally (like *calamus*) any stout grass stem, but more especially the common reed (*Phragmites communis*), 'fluuiialis arundo', Virg. Pan-pipes were made of it:—'quid me compactam ceris et arundine rides? | quae primum structa est fistula, talis erat', Mart. *Papyrus*. The name probably means River-plant; the 'rush' of the Bible. Now extinct in Lower Egypt, 'papyrifer Nilus', Ov., but still found on the White Nile. Writing material was made by gluing together in two layers slices (not peel) of the fleshy stems; it was afterwards pressed and sun-dried; 'pagina...multa crescit damnosa papyro', Juv., 'the costly sheet grows with much expenditure of papyrus' (The method of manufacturing the *papyrus* into a material for writing is described in Pliny, xiii 74—83, but only now made intelligible by Kenyon, *Palaeography*, 15.) Giant Fennel (*ferula*). One of the most striking of the umbelliferous plants characteristic of the Mediterranean flora (*Ferula communis*); 'florentes ferulas...quassans', Virg. The tough stems were used by schoolmasters, hence Martial, 'ferulaeque tristes, sceptrâ paedagogorum'. Prometheus brought fire from heaven in the pith:—

'inuisae nimium pueris, grataeque magistris,  
clara Prometheo munere ligna sumus', Mart.

99. There were two main trade routes, by which the produce of Asia reached the Mediterranean; one overland through Persia, which brought silk from N. China; the other maritime, by the Red Sea, which brought myrrh from Arabia, pepper from the Malabar Coast, and cassia from S. China. The Romans adopted from the East the practice of using unguents which took the place of our perfumes; oil being the vehicle of the scent in the one case, alcohol in the other. For the former 'inolentis oliui naturam' (Lucr.) was desirable.

Asiatic  
plant-  
products.  
*Commencia*.

Cassia (*casia*). S. China; the Cinnamon of the Bible, and the *Cinnamum* of Ovid; the different names probably only apply to bark of varying thickness. Ceylon Cinnamon was not in use till the Middle Ages. 'nec casia liquidi corruptitur usus oliui', Virg. (on the simplicity of country life). *Balanus*. The oil expressed from the kernels of *Balanites aegyptiaca*, a tree of W. Asia and Upper Egypt (the Arabic *balah*). It took its name from its acorn-shaped fruit. 'pressa tuis balanus capillis', Hor. In Syria the oil is fraudulently sold to tourists as 'Balm of Gilead'. Balsam of Mecca (*balsamum*); an oleo-resin flowing from incisions in the stem of an Arabian shrub, *Balsamodendron Opobalsamum*; 'odorato...sudantia ligno', Virg.; 'hirsuto spirant opobalsama collo', Juv. *Stacte*, 'blandum stactaeque liquorem' Lucr., was a more precious because a purer kind.

Myrrh (*myrrha*). A fragrant gum-resin from the Arabian *Balsamodendron*



*Myrrha*: 'nondum pertulerat lacrimatas cortice murras acta per aequoreas hospita naus aquas'; 'madidos murra...capillos', Ov. *Myrobalanum*. Martial's explanation of this word (*myrobalan*) has been strangely overlooked:—'quod nec Virgilius, nec carmine dixit Homerus, hoc ex unguento constat et ex balano'. This shows that it was not a tree or a fruit, but an unguent. Myron is the same as *mor*, Hebr., and is the Balsam of Mecca. (The word *myrobalan* is now the commercial term for certain acorn-shaped Indian fruits used in tanning.) Spikenard (*nardus*), a native of the Himalayas, whence through trade it reached the Mediterranean, even in Biblical times; 'Assyriaque nardo potamus uncti', Hor. Tibullus calls it Syrian; trade products commonly take their names from their commercial, not actual source. Virgil's *saliunca* was the native Celtic nard. *Malobathron*. The leaves of various Indian Cinnamons used in unguents; 'coronatus nitentes malobathro Syrio capillos', Hor. *Costum* (or *costös*), the root of *Saussurea Lappa*, a native of Cashmere, still used for scenting shawls. 'thura nec Euphrates, nec miserat India costum', Ov. Horace calls it 'Achaemenium', i.e. Persian. Cardamom (*amomum*) came from the Malabar coast. 'sit diues amomo', Ov.: 'Assyrium uulgo nascetur amomum', Virg. There was a trade route from India up the Persian Gulf. Pepper (*piper*), brought from the Malabar coast; for many ages the staple article of trade between Europe and India. 'si sapis, adde piper', Martial; 'et piper, et quicquid chartis amicitur ineptis', Hor.; 'sacrum piper', Pers., of a miser, so sparing in its use. Aloes (*aloë*). The drug came from Socotra; 'plus aloës quam mellis habet', Juv. Sugar (*saccharon*). The Latin name is derived from the Sanskrit *sakkara*, which through the Arabic *sukkar* has given the English form. It was unknown to the Hebrews; ancient knowledge of it was of the vaguest. Lucan seems to have had a glimmering:—'quique bibunt tenera dulces ab arundine succos'. Rice (*oryza*), either from Babylonia or S. India; used as a tisane, 'sume hoc ptisanarium oryzae' Hor. Ebony (*ebenum*) came from S. India. 'sola India nigrum fert ebenum', Virg. Olibanum (*thus*). Frankincense from S.E. Arabia. 'India mittit ebur; molles sua thura Sabaei', Virg. Used for incense, as still in the Greek and Roman churches, 'coronatas ubi thure piaueris aras', Prop. Savin (*herba Sabina*) was used as a cheap substitute, 'ara dabat fumos herbis contenta Sabinis', Ov. *Galbanum*. A gum resin produced by *Ferula galbaniflua*, a native of Persia. The name is derived from the Hebrew *Chelbanah*, and it was an ingredient in the incense of the Israelites.

John Martyn, F.R.S., Professor of Botany in the University of Cambridge, *The Bucolics of Virgil, with an English Translation and Notes*; London, Bibliography. 1749; *The Georgicks of Virgil*, ditto, 1741, 1746, 1755, 1827; Kurt Sprengel, *Historia rei herbariae*, Amsterdam, 1807; A. L. A. Fée, *Flore de Virgile*, Paris, 1822; Julius Billerbeck, *Flora Classica*, Leipzig, 1824; John Hogg, F.R.S., Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, *Observations on some of the Classical Plants*

of Sicily, London, 1834; Harald Othmar Lenz, *Botanik der alten Griechen und Römer*, Gotha, 1859; Pietro Bubani, *Flora Virgiliana*, Bologna, 1869; C. Fraas, *Synopsis Plantarum Florae Classicae*, ed. 2, Leipzig, 1870; F. A. Fluckiger and D. Hanbury, F.R.S., *Pharmacographia*, London, 1874; Alphonse de Candolle, *Origine des Plantes Cultivées*, Paris, 1883; Victor Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen...in ihrem Uebergang aus Asien*, ed. 8 (revised by O. Schrader and A. Engler), Berlin, 1912 (E. T. of ed. 4, *Wanderings of Plants* etc., London, 1885); O. Schrader, *Sprachvergleihung und Urgeschichte*, ed. 3, 1906—, E. T. of ed. 2 (1890) by F. B. Jevons, *Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples*, London, 1890; botanical articles in Cheyne and Black's *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 4 vols., London, 1899—1903, and in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart, 1893—.

### III. HISTORY.

#### III. I. CHRONOLOGY.

**100.** THE difficulties in which the chronology of the earlier Roman history is involved are notorious. They engaged the attention of Roman scholars at an early time. Ever since the revival of learning the problems connected with the varying schemes of the Roman year, and the Roman methods of dating historical events, have been eagerly studied. During the last thirty or forty years every nook and cranny of the subject have been explored. The present survey must confine itself to the more assured results of inquiry, avoiding the numerous matters of controversy, many of which will never be brought to a decision, although the debate concerning them has cast interesting side-lights on Roman history, and especially on the evolution of the tradition which embodied it in ancient times.

**101.** For material we depend in the first place and mainly on the ancient writers who touch upon the history and antiquities of the Roman state. The more careful of the professed ancient historians had worked out for themselves, at least in the rough, some scheme of chronology. But they often darkened counsel by failing to bring into accord with it the indications of time used by writers from whom they borrowed. Thus, for example, Polybius (i 6) gives the result of a very careful inquiry, touching one of the cardinal dates of the Roman records, that of the battle by the river Allia. This he fixes in the year which is 387 B.C. in our accepted denotation. But a little further on (ii 14—22) his story points to a date considerably later, perhaps as late as 381 B.C. Livy, again, is sometimes unsteady in his chronological references, adopting from his predecessors now one system, now another. Later writers like Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus, Appian, Cassius Dio, are similarly inconstant. Naturally, the more remote the events described are, the greater are the chronological difficulties attendant upon them. The tradition of Roman history earlier than the time of Sulla was largely dependent on the writers who are known as ‘annalists’; and it is notorious that the later ‘annalists’ introduced corruptions from which the earlier were free. It is now generally allowed that, for the ages preceding the Second Punic War, Polybius and Diodorus followed an older and better tradition than that which was for the most part accepted by

Livy and the rest of the historians; yet Polybius and Diodorus adopted, here and there, elements from the later sources.

102. Internal criticism of the surviving historians themselves and comparison between them have enabled modern scholars to throw considerable light on Roman chronology. But far more important has been the application of evidence which lies outside the writings of the historians by profession. Many kinds of material have been pressed into the service; allusions and references scattered over Roman and late Greek literature; facts revealed by inscriptions; deductions from eclipses mentioned by the ancients; but above all the remnants which have been spared to us of the ancient literature bearing upon the antiquities of the Roman state. Welcome light has sometimes been discerned in remote corners. Thus a nameless writer known as 'the chronographer of 354 A.D.' supplies some valuable matter. What may be roughly described as antiquarian, in contrast with strictly historical inquiry, began earlier even than the age of Cato the Censor; from his time onwards the chain of Roman antiquarians was not broken. The great polymath Varro summed up and superseded the labours of earlier scholars. Little of his work has been transmitted to us at first hand; but what we have received from him, even at second, third, or fourth hand, is often of consequence. In this class, the principal works which have been preserved are those of the elder Pliny, A. Gellius (born about 130 A.D.), Censorinus (third century A.D.), author of the work entitled *de die natali*, Iulius Solinus (perhaps of about the same date), who made a collection of *res memorabiles*, and Macrobius, whose *Saturnalia* belongs to the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century. But all these writers present a curious mixture of truth and error. The *Fasti* of Ovid, owing to its confusions, counts for little in recent discussions. It may here be noticed that, as Greeks were at work on Roman chronology before the Romans touched it, and as early Roman dates depended largely on synchronisms with events in Greek history, dated by Olympiads or in other ways, a knowledge of Greek modes of reckoning time is important for the comprehension of the methods used at different times by Romans.

103. It is best to begin by explaining in outline the history of the Roman Calendar, by which the length of the Roman year, as defined by authority, was determined. The early Romans were an agricultural community, and for the operations of the farmer it is imperative that there should be some means of recognising the approach of the seasons of the year, as dependent on the course of the sun. Long before the official Calendar became a trustworthy guide, the Italian peasant, like the Greek, observed the risings and settings of certain constellations, as Arcturus and the Pleiades, and so divided the year into seasonal sections. Even after the Calendar was reduced to order, the tiller of the soil clung to this system, which is as prominent in late Latin writings on agriculture as it is in the *Works and Days* of Hesiod.

Further  
evidence.

The Roman  
Calendar.



**104.** Many of the assertions current in ancient times with regard to the early history of the official Calendar year are clearly legendary. The Roman year. There was a wide-spread belief that Romulus established a year which comprised ten months; but the number of days contained in it was variously given, most commonly however at 304. This figment existed as early as the time of M. Fulvius Nobilior, pontifex maximus in the early part of the second century B.C. Its absurdity was perceived by C. Licinius Macer, the annalist and democratic leader of Cicero's time (*Censor. de die n. c.* 20). Some imagined that the ten-month year had been at one time prevalent all over Italy. An indication of it was thought to have survived in the custom which required a widow to observe mourning for her husband during ten months. Niebuhr used the tale of the ten-month year in framing his explanation of *fenus unciarium*, which he believed to be one-twelfth of the capital for a year of ten months, that is  $8\frac{1}{3}$  per cent., increased to 10 per cent. when the year came to embrace twelve months. But these presumed indications have no validity. The complement of the story about Romulus was the supposition that Numa added the months of January and February to the year and fixed the number of days at 355. The significance of the number 355 will appear presently.

**105.** It will be seen that the structure of the year which the ancients attributed to Romulus is not lunar; for the number of days contained in it is not a multiple of the days in the lunar month. Probably of lunar origin. But the number 355 is very nearly equivalent to the number of days to which twelve lunar months extend. That, in the dim prehistoric time, the Roman month accorded with the period of the moon, seems fairly certain. There are clear indications that the day named *Idus* originally marked the time of the full moon, in the middle of the month, while the first day or *Kalendæ* indicated the day of the new moon (see also § 111). Subsequently, when a sun-year took the place of a moon-year, the original connexion of the month with the moon was necessarily obscured. The *Idus*, which must in the earlier time have fallen on the same day in every month, now came sometimes on the thirteenth day from the beginning of the month, sometimes on the fifteenth. The avoidance of the fourteenth day seems to have been due to a deeply rooted superstition that even numbers were unlucky; of this we shall find more illustrations as we proceed. Some of the ancients traced this belief to the influence of the Pythagorean system in Italy; and writers on Roman chronology are still apt to make play with the name of Pythagoras, chiefly on the ground that the superstition is neither genuinely Italic nor genuinely Greek, and on that account must have had a definite origin.

**106.** A year of  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days was known in a remote age at Babylon and in Egypt, and passed into Greece, and thence to southern Italy, The year of 365½ days. in all probability at least as early as the date usually accepted for the foundation of the Roman Republic (509 B.C.). But

between a moon-year and this sun-year no means of accommodation exists. No limited number of lunar months will yield a number of days which shall be a definite multiple of  $365\frac{1}{4}$ . The Calendar therefore proceeded without regard to the moon. From a very remote time till the dictatorship of Julius Caesar, the *normal* or *basal* year at Rome comprised 355 days. As the number 354 is more nearly equal than 355 to twelve lunar months, it was believed that Numa added the 355th day in obedience to the aversion for even numbers. If this aversion is older than the Republic, it did not originate with Pythagoras. A cycle of four years was early invented, in which the first year was of 355 days, the second of 377, the third of 355, the fourth of 378 (Censor. c. 20; Macrob. i 13). The cycle thus embraced 1465 days, and the average year was one of  $366\frac{1}{4}$  days.

The cycle of  
four years  
averaging  $366\frac{1}{4}$   
days.

107. If no provision had been made for leaving out some days periodically, since the average year was too long, the Calendar would in time have become useless for the purpose of indicating the seasons of the solar year. Thus the chief object for which the Calendar existed would have been frustrated. Some of the most ancient religious observances would have been rendered absurd, if they had not coincided with certain of the natural seasons. The early Roman religion was above all a religion of the farm and the fold, and the Calendar would have had no religious value had it strayed far away from the sun. Thus the archaic ceremonies maintained by the Salii, or priests of Mars, were meaningless unless celebrated in the spring of the year; so too with the festival of the vintage, the *Vinalia*, which was bound to take place in the autumn. On this ground alone, not to mention others, we must suppose that the early Romans kept their official Calendar in fair agreement with the sun's course. Macrobius (i 13, 13) declares without indication of date, that a cycle of 24 years existed, and that during the last eight years of the cycle 24 days were allowed to drop. This may possibly have been effected by leaving out three *nundina* (see § 117) or periods of eight days each. Recent writers are not agreed as to the date at which the 24-year cycle was introduced. The best view is that of Unger, who starts the cycle with the first day of *Martius* 497 B.C. But Soltau makes this cycle no older than 191 B.C. He imagines (on insufficient reasons) that before then the four-year cycle normally contained 1464, not 1465 days. Thus the average year exceeded the year of  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days by the space of three-quarters of a day. This leads Soltau to the hypothesis of a 32-year cycle for the period 445—191 B.C. during the last eight years of which, thirty-two times three-quarters of a day, that is to say, 24 days, were expunged. As there is now a pretty general agreement that some method of maintaining the year at an average length of  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days was devised far earlier than 191 B.C., and probably as early as the date laid down for the Decemvirate, or even the creation of the Republic, the question of the antiquity of the 24-year cycle is comparatively unimportant.

Correction of  
the Calendar.

**108.** The normal year of 355 days was divided into twelve months ; seven of twenty-nine days each, four of thirty-one, and one of twenty-eight. The 28-day month was *Februarius*; the 31-day months were *Martius*, *Maius*, *Quintilis*, *October*, while to *Ianuarius*, *Aprilis*, *Iunius*, *Sextilis*, *September*, *November*, *December*, were allotted 29 days each. Doubtless, in early days, the Calendar-year began with the *Martius mensis*, and ended with *Februarius* in the first and third years of the four-year cycle, in the other two years with the month (*intercalaris*) which consisted of the interposed days, along with five days taken from *Februarius* (§ 109). The assumption (by Holzapfel and others) of an early sacral year which began in *Ianuarius* is untenable. (The Calendar-year in question was quite independent of the year as defined from time to time for the tenure of magistracies. See § 144.) The month *Martius* was in part dedicated to Mars, primarily the god of spring-time and youth, rather than of war. *Aprilis*, the 'opening month', points to the growth of vegetation. The names of *Maius* and *Iunius* are not so significant, though the connexion of *Iun-ius* with *Iun-o* and *iun-ior* is probable. The six months that follow were denoted by numbers, according to their distance from *Martius*. Why the numeration began with the fifth and ended with the tenth month, is not easy to explain. We may conjecture that in early days the numeration extended over the whole of the twelve months. *Ianuarius* was obviously not named, as later Romans supposed, because it was the 'gate' (*ianua*) of the year, but as related to the worship of the divinity Ianus. And *Februarius* is the time at which were celebrated the *februa*, or expiatory ceremonies in honour of the dead. By a law of Marcus Antonius, passed in 44 B.C. before Caesar's death, *Quintilis* became *Iulius* in honour of the dictator whose birthday fell within it, and for a similar reason *Sextilis* received the new name of *Augustus*. Flattery of the emperors later on induced other changes of the kind, but they all proved transient.

**109.** In the years when 22 or 23 days were added to the ordinary number of 355, they were inserted after the 23rd day of *Februarius*, which ended on that day. The remaining five days along with the inserted days constituted a thirteenth month, called *intercalaris*. The statement that this month was called *Mercedonius* rests on an error of Plutarch (Unger, in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, p. 789). Why the *mensis intercalaris* was not placed in what seems its natural position, after the last day of *Februarius*, has not been satisfactorily explained. We hear also of a *dies intercalaris*, which was sometimes added to the year, and in compensation a later day was left out (see § 123).

**110.** Three days in each month were marked by special names. The opening day was *Kalendae*. The seventh day of the 31-day months and the fifth day of the others (see § 108) were entitled *Nonae*. On the 13th or the 15th day, that is to say, eight days after the *Nonae*, came the *Idus*. It has

The twelve months.

The intercalary month.

Kalends,  
Nones, and  
Ides.

been supposed that originally *Nonae* marked the end of the *first* quarter of the moon's course; but this is more than doubtful. If it were the fact, we should expect to find some day in the latter half of the month, specially named, which indicated in early times the end of the *third* quarter. Reckoning backward from the *Idus* to the *Nonae* we have a period of eight days, which the Romans, who favoured an inclusive mode of reckoning, called nine; hence the name. The plural forms *Kalendae*, *Nonae*, *Idus*, like *nundinae*, and our *vespers*, *matins*, etc., were at first collective terms, the application to single days coming later. In denoting those days of the month to which no special name was given, the Romans looked forward to the next succeeding day which had a designation of its own, and then reckoned backward, counting in both terms of the series. (This retrograde method of reckoning existed in some of the Greek states. There are some traces in the Roman Calendar, as in the name *Quinquatrus*, of an earlier usage of progressive reckoning from the *Idus*.) The arrangement by which the *Idus* fell in the shorter months on the 13th, and in the longer on the 15th, had one convenient consequence. In every one of the months, excepting *Februarius*, the sixteen days at the end were numbered alike. The Latin phrases used, such as *ante diem quartum Idus*, *ante diem quartum decimum Kalendas* (usually shortened to *a. d. IV. Id.*; *a. d. XIV. Kal.*), are not easy to explain from the point of view of grammar. The whole composite name of a day is often entirely treated as if it were a single word; so Cic. *in Catil.* i 7: *certo die, qui dies futurus esset a. d. XII. Kal. Nou.* and *ibid.*: *in a. d. V. Kal. Nou.* It must be further noticed that the ordinary method of reckoning is often abandoned in the case of the days which precede or follow the *Kalendae*, *Nonae*, and *Idus*, which are denoted as *pridie*, *postridie Kalendas*, etc. Days on which prominent religious festivals took place were commonly indicated by the names of the festivals; thus Feb. 15 was known as *Lupercalia*, Feb. 23 as *Terminalia*, Ap. 21 as *Parilia*. We find also *postridie Terminalia* (once even *a. d. V. Terminalia*) and the like expressions, and even *Saturnalia secunda*, for the second day of the *Saturnalia* (Cic. *ad Att.* xiii 51, 1).

III. The Calendar was designed before all things to secure the due observance of religious rites; its secular uses were, at least in the earlier age, secondary. Naturally therefore the College of Pontifices, who kept a general outlook upon religion, exercised great influence upon its structure. Varro (*Ling. Lat.* vi 27) tells us how a *pontifex minor* (not a member of the College but an underling) made regularly on the *Kalendae* an announcement of the time at which the *Nonae* would arrive. He used a kind of sing-song addressed to Juno: 'dies te quinque calo, Iuno Couella', or: 'septem dies te calo, Iuno Couella' (Juno, Queen of the sky). The notion of 'calling aloud' appears in *calo* (cf. *comitia calata*), and in several other words connected with the Calendar, as *Kalendae*, *inter-calare*, and the *Curia Calabra*, on the Capitoline hill, where the *pontifex minor* took his stand to

The Pontifices  
and the  
Calendar.



make his proclamation. Needless to say, the announcement, natural when the year was lunar, was a mere survival when the solar year was adopted. We are told by ancient writers that the Pontifices were sometimes negligent, sometimes even corrupt, in the exercise of their office. Censorinus, *de die nat.* (20, 7), asserts that they at times misused their power by intercalating days or not intercalating them, merely in order to lengthen or to shorten some magistrate's year of office, or to increase the gains of some government contractor, or to inflict loss upon him. Other writers, as Cicero and Ovid, speak rather of the ignorance than of the caprice of the Pontifices (*uitium pontificum*). In extant records there is little to bear out the sweeping accusations of Censorinus.

**112.** But until 191 B.C. the Pontifices had not supreme authority over the Calendar. By a sure inference from some ancient passages we find that in that year the consul M' Acilius Glabrio passed a law giving them full control (Censor. 20, 6; Solin. i 43; Macrobian. i 13, 31). The Calendar had then fallen into disorder, and a reform was needed, which the Pontifices could not, apparently, carry out without fresh statutory powers. We know but little of enactments of the kind preceding the *lex Acilia*. There is a tradition concerning a *lex Pinaria* of 472 B.C., which dealt with *intercalatio*; and of another enacted by the Decemvirs. Connected with this is the celebrated tradition concerning Cn. Flavius, the clerk of the famous censor Appius Claudius (312 B.C.). He is said to have posted a Calendar up in the forum, by which the citizens were informed precisely what days during the year would be *fasti*, that is to say, when the praetor's court would be open (Liv. ix 46, 5). In this way he 'picked out the crows' eyes' (Cic. *pro Murena*, 25), and by making public the knowledge which had before belonged to the *arxana* of the Pontifical College, undermined the dominance over the law, enjoyed by a clique of aristocrats. This tradition is in conflict with another which declared that the *fasti dies* had already been proclaimed by the Decemvirs. The story of Flavius is not intelligible unless we suppose that, at or about the same time, a statute was passed declaring the principles upon which the Calendar was based, so that thereafter any one could construct the Calendar for himself. In that case the duty of the Pontifices would be restricted to the making of formal declarations. It is a natural conjecture that the *lex Ogulnia* of 300 B.C., which admitted plebeians to the Pontifical College, was connected with some reform of the Calendar.

**113.** From the earliest times the uses to which days might be put were noted on the Calendar. Against each day was set one out of seven marks. These are F, C, N, NP, EN, and for two days (the 24th day of *Martius* and the 24th day of *Maius*) the letters Q, R, C, E., and for the 15th day of *Iunius* the letters Q, S, D, F. The sign F alone is brief for *fas est ius dicere* (Varro, *L. L.* vi 29; Ovid, *Fasti* i 47; Macrobian. i 16, 14). Each of these days is *dies fastus*, a day on which the court of the *praetor urbanus* is open to litigants. So stringent

The *lex Acilia*  
and earlier  
enactments.

*Dies Fasti*,  
*Nefasti*, etc.

was the ordinance which bound the court in early days that, if the praetor even unwittingly gave judgment on a day not marked F, he was bound to expiate his offence by offering a victim in sacrifice. But the *praetor urbanus* alone was subject to these restrictions, and only in some of his functions. Other judges were exempt. Days marked C (*comitiales*) were reserved for meetings of the *Comitia*. But if no assembly chanced to be summoned for one of these days, it became *dies fastus*. It was a standing principle of the Roman polity that the praetor and the *Comitia* should not interfere with each other. But the loose meetings of Roman citizens called *contiones*, at which no decisions were taken, were not restricted to the *dies comitiales*. N indicates *nefas*, and a day marked by it is *nefastus*; but this is not merely the opposite of *dies fastus*. On the *dies nefasti* not only was the praetor's court closed, but on them no assemblies could meet. The sign NP is still of doubtful interpretation. The old explanation '*nefastus parte*' is now rejected. Perhaps the most probable solution is that of Soltau: *nefas, feriae publicae*, the abbreviation having undergone some distortion of form. The letters EN stand for *endotercisus*, or in later form *intercisus*, and denote days which were partly *fasti*, partly *nefasti*. Against March 24 and May 24 stand the letters Q. R. C. F., i.e. *quando rex comitiauit, fas*. When the *rex sacrorum* had transacted certain business in the *Comitium*, these days became *fasti*. They were the two days on which, in early times, *testamenta* were presented to the *comitia calata curiata*. Similarly on June 15, Q. S. D. F. means *quando stercus delatum, fas*. That is to say, this is the annual day for cleaning the temple of Vesta, and when the rubbish has been removed, legal business may be carried on. These three exceptional days were known as *dies fissi*.

114. The reasons which influenced the early constructors of the Calendar in thus distributing the days of the year are not now clearly discernible through the mist of antiquity. Superstition and traditions of disaster connected with certain days played a great part. The working of these considerations is seen even in the historical period. But the later marking of certain days as *atri* or *religiosi*, such as the days of the battles by the Crēmēra and the Allia, had not the effect of completely changing their character, and belongs to the history rather of Roman religion than of Roman chronology.

115. The number of regular and fixed *dies fasti*, probably only 36 before the time of Julius Caesar, was remarkably small. They comprised in each month the *Kalendae* and the day following, the *Nonae* and the day following, and the day after the *Idus*; but only in so far as these days were not marked N. Thus there was no *dies fastus* in *Februarius*, which was given over to expiatory and penitential services; and (in the Augustan time) only one in *Quintilis* or *Iulius*. The days on which public sacrifice was offered (*feriae publicae*) are usually characterized by NP. It is so with 39 out of 46 such days, which are noted in the Augustan Calendar. The other seven are stamped with N. One of these is the day on which the mysterious

*Regifugium* was observed (Feb. 24), while the corresponding *Poplifugium* on III. Non. Iul., is NP. Other NP days are *Kal. Mart.*, and all the *Idus*, excepting *Id. Iun.*, and 19 other such days were added by Augustus, so that, by the end of his reign, they amounted to 70. The strength of the prejudice against even numbers is seen in the fact that all the older *feriae*, with one or two exceptions, fell on days which, reckoning from the beginning of the month, would be denoted by odd numbers. But the superstition had worn itself out by the time of Augustus, for his festival, the *Augustalia*, was fixed for the twelfth day in October. The N days amounted to 55; the EN days were eight. The C days, taken together, were about 184. The character of some days is difficult to determine.

116. It was possible for clashing claims to meet on the same day. In this case, if one of the claims was religious and the other secular, religion took precedence. Thus the *feriae conceptivae*, which were allotted to no particular times in the Calendar, would change the character of the days to which they were assigned in any year. So with the *feriae imperativae*, or exceptional festivals which might be proclaimed by competent authority. More than once in the history of Rome, consuls ordered *feriae* for all comitial days, so as to stop legislation by their rivals; for on days of *feriae* assemblies could not meet (Appian, *B. C.* i 55; Plut. *Sull.* 8; Dio C. xxxviii 6). A law of Hortensius in 287 B.C. declared the *nundinae* or market-days to be *fasti* (Granius Licinianus ap. Macrob. i 16, 30). This can only have held good in so far as these coincided with *dies comitiales*; for a day once dedicated entirely or in part to sacred uses could never be wholly reclaimed for the world. This law was an unfortunate one in the history of the Republic. On the very days on which the largest numbers of voters would naturally be in the city, no legislation could take place. Some of the ancients supposed that the *nundinae* had in the first age been actually devised for legislation.

117. A few words must be said of the Roman week of eight days, or *nundinum*, literally 'a nine days' time,' according to the ancient mode of reckoning. In the Calendar each of the eight days had a letter set opposite to it. The first day (*nundinae*) had A assigned to it, and each of the succeeding days one of the following letters up to H. This usage gave rise to the so-called 'dominical letters' which the custom of the Church has attached to the days of our week, employing the seven letters from A to G. A phrase which is common is *trinum nundinum*; it is the space which by law must elapse between the promulgation of a statute and the voting upon it in the assembly, also between the last of the preliminary hearings of a criminal case tried before an assembly, and the final meeting at which the vote on the question of acquittal or condemnation was taken. (Curiously the question is still disputed whether *trinum nundinum* is the equivalent of *tria nundina*, or is such a space of time that three *nundinae* fall within it; i.e. 17 days at the least, or 31 days at the most.) At the end of the Republican period

candidates for office were obliged to announce themselves in the city for the space of *trinum nundinum* preceding the election. Ancient writers attributed to the institution of the *nundinae* a high antiquity; and this seems to be confirmed by the fact that the *Nonae* and the *Idus* were separated by just the space of a *nundinum*; also by the mention of the *nundina* in a fragment of the XII tables. Mommsen's idea that the knowledge of the Oriental seven-day week led to the creation of the Roman eight-day week, so that the latter must be comparatively late in origin, seems untenable. The importance of the *nundinae* in the eyes of the common people is attested by some superstitions connected with it, which will be mentioned below (§ 123).

118. In the last days of the Republic, between 59 and 46 B.C., the Calendar fell into great disorder, because intercalation was omitted. The reason for the neglect is hard to divine; so Confusion of  
the Calendar. hard that some scholars have charged the confusion upon Caesar, the Pontifex Maximus, who is deemed to have herein followed his usual policy of aggravating the sickness of the body politic, in order to excuse his vigorous surgery. But evidence is against the assumption. Curio, the tribune of 50 B.C., who was one of the Pontifices, having failed to make progress with legislative measures, tried to induce his colleagues to insert an intercalary month in the year, so as to prolong his term of office (Dio, xl 62). On their refusal, he joined the Caesarean party. He evidently blamed the anti-Caesareans for the state of the Calendar (Caelius ap. Cic. *Fam.* viii 6, 5). A symptom of the disorder is seen in the urgency with which Cicero begs Atticus to fight against intercalation in 51 B.C., so that his tenure of Cilicia may not be prolonged even for a few days (*Ad Att.* v 9, 2).

119. In 46 B.C. Caesar propounded in a proclamation a scheme of reform. He clearly did not act as Pontifex Maximus, but as Dictator. This office, as bestowed upon him when he Caesar's  
reform. returned from the battle of Thapsus, gave him almost unlimited power. It is certain that the Chief Pontiff had no authority to issue an edict such as that in which Caesar embodied far-reaching changes. In order to wipe out the consequences of past neglect, it was necessary that the year 46 B.C. (called by Macrobius the *annus confusionis*) should extend to 445 days. The normal number of 355 days had already been increased by the addition of the ordinary 23 days, inserted after Feb. 23. As many as 67 days, divided into two *menses intercalares* (*prior* and *posterior*), were now interposed between November and December. These 67 days represent no doubt the sum of the days of three intercalary periods which had been dropped (= 22 + 23 + 22 days). This year thus consisted of 15 months (Suet. *Caes.* 40).

120. A profound alteration was now made in the structure of the normal year. The old awkward practice of intercalation (common to many ancient States besides the Roman) was abolished. The normal year was extended



from 355 to 365 days. Every four years an additional day was to be added; so that the average year comprised  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days. This was somewhat too large; hence Pope Gregory XIII in 1582 excised the accumulated excess of time, and took measures to prevent the error from being repeated. His scheme was not adopted in our country until 1752, and the adherents of the Greek Church still cling to the Calendar of Julius Caesar.

**121.** In working out the details of his reform, Caesar proceeded with true Roman conservatism, making as little alteration as possible in the quality of the days as defined in the ancient Calendar. *Ianuarius*, *Sextilis* and *December*, to which 29 days previously belonged, now received two new days, which were placed immediately after the 28th. To *Iunius*, *September* and *November* an addition of one day each was made (also inserted after the 28th), so that they now contained 30 days each. An extra day was given to *Aprilis*; it followed on the 25th, not on the 28th, because on the latter day began the games in honour of Flora. The *Floralia*, though not technically *feriae publicae*, were popular with the vulgar. The ten new days were all *fasti*, but one acquired the character NP in the reign of Augustus. It will be observed that they were so distributed as to leave the *Kal. Non. Id.* of every month unaffected. The only changes of dating fell on those days in the increased months which succeeded the *Idus*. The old *feriae publicae* were still to be celebrated on the same days, relatively to the beginnings of the months, as before. The day which was to be added to the year *quarto quoque anno*, was interjected between Feb. 23 and Feb. 24. As Feb. 23 was *a. d. VI. Kal. Mart.*, this 'leap-year' day was denoted as *a. d. bis VI. Kal. Mart.*, and by a curious error came to be known as *bisextum* (Censor. xx 10) or later still as *bisextus*; but some ancients regarded *bisextum* as a two-day space, consisting of Feb. 23 plus the new day (Digest). Hence we speak of the year with the added day as 'bisextile'. Even in the Gregorian Calendar the added day is assumed to be Feb. 24, not Feb. 29, because the festival of S. Matthias is in leap-year changed from Feb. 24 to Feb. 25.

**122.** It is a strange thing that so clear a scheme should in one respect have been misinterpreted immediately after Caesar's death. This was due to an ambiguity inherent in ancient modes of reckoning, which made it possible to interpret *quarto quoque anno* as marking a space of three, not four years (Macrobius i 14, 15 has *quinto quoque anno*). Thus in 36 years 12 days were intercalated, instead of 9 (Solin. i 46; Macrob. i 14). In B.C. 8, Augustus arranged that until A.D. 8 there should be no insertion of the extra day. It was at this time that the month *Sextilis* received the name of *Augustus*. In one or two respects, modern scholars are not clear about Caesar's intentions. There has been much controversy about the time at which the first insertion of the leap-year day was made; also with regard to the precise day on which

the first of the new four-year cycles began. Although the controversy is not without importance, it is too technical to be treated here.

123. A curious piece of information connected with this epoch is supplied by Cassius Dio (xlviii 33). He says that, in order to obviate a collision between the *nundinae* and the first day of *Ianuarius* in the year 41 B.C., an extra day was inserted in the preceding year, and was dropped out afterwards, the excised day being Jan. 29. This practice was repeated later, so that Jan. 29 became a changeable day. Macrobius however (i 13, 16) asserts that a moveable day was added by Numa for this very purpose of keeping *nundinae* and New Year's Day asunder.

Controversy on 'the moveable dies intercalaris'.

These two passages have given occasion to abundant controversy, some scholars holding with Dio that the device of the shifting day was new, others with Macrobius that it went back to dim antiquity. The matter is complicated by another statement of Macrobius (*ibid.*), that the moveable day was also used to prevent collision between the *nundinae* and all the *Nonae*. This has struck most scholars as wildly improbable; but Soltau has constructed a highly artificial scheme for the purpose of maintaining the credit of the statement. On the whole, it seems likely that the superstition about the *nundinae* was of late origin. It is known that Jan. 1 of the year 43 B.C. coincided with a *nundinae*. And the ancient writers who record the superstition account for it by saying that years in which the collision had occurred had been observed to prove themselves disastrous. This does not accord very well with a remote origin. Some ancient passages (especially Livy xliii 11), which have been taken to prove the existence of the moveable *dies intercalaris* at a time earlier than the Augustan, have been misinterpreted (Unger, in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, § 81).

124. The alterations in the Calendar after the age of Augustus are almost entirely restricted to the addition of numerous *feriae publicae*, partly in honour of the emperors, living and dead, partly for the worship of divinities such as Isis, Serāpis, and others, whose official recognition came late. The tendency continually was to increase the number of idle days, and the list of festivals was repeatedly cut down. In particular, Vespasian and Marcus Aurelius reformed the Calendar in this manner. (On the Calendar, see also § 220 *infra*.)

Post-Augustan alterations.

125. We must now turn to the methods by which the Romans arrived at the dates for events which we find recorded in their history. It was only at a late period in the existence of ancient communities that fixed rules were established for measuring the distance between present time and the occurrences which they deemed to fall within their past history. The Greek towns in Hellenistic times were very ready to change their 'aera' in order to commemorate some event regarded as crucial, and such alterations were often connected with the Roman government (see Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *aera*). The reckoning

Roman methods of determining historic dates.

by Olympiads did not come into general use in Greece till the third century B.C., and did not even then supersede the multitudinous local usages. Our present reckoning from the birth of Christ was not generally current till the age of Charlemagne. The chief point of departure for Roman history, the foundation of the city, was not dated to the general satisfaction until the end of the Republican period. Till then, other points of departure were used along with it, as the expulsion of the Tarquins, the erection of the great Capitoline temple, the capture of Rome by the Gauls. Thus Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* xxxiii 19) mentions a tablet which Cn. Flavius (the associate of Appius Claudius the censor of 312 B.C.) affixed to the temple of Concordia founded by him. This stated that 204 years had elapsed since the dedication of the great temple of Iuppiter on the Capitol.

126. The official and regular method of dating documents, which persisted to the latest times, was to refer to the consuls of the particular year. For historical and literary, and even for legal purposes, this practice was highly inconvenient, and, when reference had to be made to the earliest days of the Republic, well-nigh useless. Therefore, from the dawn of Roman literature, a better way was sought. A long line of Roman antiquarians, availing themselves of earlier or contemporary Greek researches, and seeking to supplement them from other sources, laboured to bring order into the chaotic chronology of their country's history. The writers of the Empire added little or nothing to the work of their predecessors. According to their wont, they were content to pillage the stores which had been already amassed.

127. These scholars aimed particularly at determining a few leading dates; especially those of the foundation of the city, of the establishment of the Republic, and of the great Gaulish invasion. What means were open to them? In the first place, the synchronisms between Italian and Greek history were of great importance. In this field the later Greek historians, and other Greek investigators contemporary with them, had laboured much, and exercised great influence over the Romans. Certain eclipses mentioned in early records were eagerly canvassed, with the aid of astronomers, principally Greek. Naturally the Roman explorers paid more attention than the Greeks to the examination of Italian and Roman records. Cato the Censor showed in his *Origines* the importance of examining the traditions of the Italian towns. But this field was never thoroughly traversed by his successors; they preferred to use the material they found closer at hand. The nature of this material can only be indicated in a general manner.

128. The tendency of the Romans to preserve records has been, on the whole, much underrated by modern scholars. The nation had from of old a most profound veneration for precedent. The complicated political and religious institutions which they developed could only be kept in smooth working order by the formation of chains of precedents and by the maintenance of an almost

Determination  
of a few  
leading dates.

Preservation  
of records.

superstitious reverence for them. We know that in the late Republican time there existed, in connexion with many historic offices, religious and secular, minute-books (*commentarii*) which must in many cases have embodied matter of ancient date, though often obscured by the embellishments of recent generations. Again, the treaties concluded between Rome and foreign peoples or princes supplied chronological information of the highest importance. Much stress has been laid by modern critics on the destruction of records by fire at the time of the Gaulish invasion, and they have very generally gone far beyond the statements of Livy and other ancient writers. But practical necessity would compel the restoration of many documents, and this is particularly the case with treaties and statutes on which the government would have to act continually. Polybius believed that a treaty with Carthage, a copy of which existed in his time, was as old as 509 B.C.; and modern criticism has not shown this to be impossible.

129. Of much consequence were copies of statutes and *senatusconsulta*, inscribed on bronze and preserved in the *aerarium*; while in early times other copies were stored for plebeian use in the shrine of Diana on the Aventine. Inscribed monuments relating to historic events existed in ancient temples and tombs, and in trophies, such as the celebrated column of Duilius. We may suppose that the number of these which passed out of existence without being critically examined by the later historians or antiquarians was considerable; and some were only noticed when they had been tampered with or falsified. Some public records were in private keeping. Families to which censors had belonged were proud of preserving the censorial lists. Although they were sometimes corrupted, much sound information was to be drawn from them.

130. The efforts of Roman scholars were largely directed to compiling, from all sources open to them, lists of magistrates, and particularly of consuls from the beginning of the Republic. To Fasti. these lists the name *Fasti* was peculiarly applied. From indicating merely a catalogue of *fasti dies*, the word had come to denote, first an annual Calendar, then an annalistic chronicle. In the search for magistrates' names, the *Annales Maximi*, or annals of the Pontifical College, finally published by Mucius Scaevola in 130 B.C., were much used. These *Annales* recorded such events as especially interested the College, and dated them by the magistrates' names. How early continuous lists of magistrates' names were published by authority we cannot tell, but that regular catalogues existed in the time of the earliest annalists, and indeed much earlier, is clear. In the reign of Augustus two important compilations were drawn up, of which we possess considerable fragments. These are known as the *Fasti Capitolini* (so called because the extant fragments are now in a Museum on the Capitol), and the *Fasti Triumphales*. The *Fasti Capitolini* originally contained the names of Republican consuls, *tribuni militares consulari imperio* (two for each year), dictators, *magistri equitum*, and censors. The *Fasti Triumphales* were restricted to such



magistrates and pro-magistrates as had obtained the triumph. Both lists were fastened to the wall of the *Regia*, the official residence of the Pontifex Maximus. The missing portions of the lists can almost wholly be supplied from extant sources. The anonymous compiler who is known as the 'Chronographer of 354 A.D.' gave a list of 'eponymous' magistrates, *i.e.* consuls and consular tribunes, from the beginning of the Republic to the date of his work. The names were ultimately drawn from the *Fasti Capitolini*, with a certain amount of revision. Other lists of the kind are extant.

131. Before the publication of the *Fasti Capitolini*, there seems to have existed no catalogue of Republican magistrates which met with general acceptance. Livy repeatedly betrays his distress amid the discrepancies encountered in the different annalists and in the *libri magistratum* (ii 4; iv 7). By 'books of magistrates' were probably meant the *Annales Maximi* and certain 'linen volumes' (*libri lintei*) preserved in the temple of Juno Moneta, and quoted by Licinius Macer, the democratic tribune and historian who died in 66 B.C.; also perhaps separate chronicles of magistrates compiled by writers near Livy's time (cp. § 130). It is easy to draw from passages in Livy and other historians an exaggerated impression of the extent to which these lists differed from one another. If the divergences had been exceedingly numerous (as has often been assumed), there would be in extant literature a far greater number of allusions to the differences than we actually find. The discrepancies which disclose themselves have been subjected to searching criticism by many modern scholars. Some of the results will be given later; but many controversial matters must be passed by.

132. Putting aside for the moment particular discrepancies, we must turn to the general question of the credibility of the *Fasti* for the earlier part of Republican history. We are not here concerned with the uncertainty of the actual events of that time, about which Polybius, Dionysius and many other writers complain. Did the succession of magistrates rest on a genuine tradition, or was it a product, to a large extent, of late invention and redaction? Modern scholars have often urged too far their deductions from some well-known ancient passages. Thus Livy (viii 40) speaks of 'tradition impaired by funeral eulogies, and by falsified inscriptions on family busts, as each family deceitfully and lyingly appropriates to itself the glory of great achievements and distinctions'. So too Cicero (*Brut.* 62), doubtless relying on information obtained from Atticus:—'By these (funeral eulogies) our history has become somewhat faulty; in them is written much that is not fact; forged triumphs; exaggerations in the number of consulships; fictitious pedigrees and transfers (of patricians) to the plebeian ranks, whereby men of low extraction streamed into families of the same name with which they had nothing to do'. Passages like these do, indeed, assert that the *Fasti* of the early Republic were to some extent untrustworthy; but the principal

The credibility  
of the *Fasti*.

allegation is, not that the names were largely forged, but that the parvenus of the later time appropriated to themselves the glories of older families which bore the same names.

133. Apart from minor considerations, the discrepancies in the lists and in the dates mainly depend on four things, (a) differences in the estimates of the age of the city and of the Republican form of government; (b) the treatment of four years (in our ordinary notation 333, 324, 309, 301 B.C.), which some writers, finding no consuls' names recorded, expunged altogether, while others supposed that dictators had taken the place of consuls; (c) the manner of dealing with 'the years of anarchy', during which, as the main tradition assumed, no magistrates at all had been elected for five years (375—371 B.C.); (d) the time allotted for the duration of the Decemviral government. We will deal with these topics in order.

Sources of  
discrepancies.

134. The legend of Aeneas was naturalised in Rome as early as 300 B.C. Estimates of the age of the city were therefore influenced by the dates assigned to the fall of Troy, about which the Greek authorities disagreed. When the Roman chronologers had made up their minds concerning the antiquity of the Republic, relying on the records of 'eponymous' magistrates, they had to determine what stretch of time was to be allowed for the seven traditional kings. They then had to consider, with reference to the fall of Troy, in what year Aeneas set foot in Italy. In the earliest forms of the Aeneas legend, the founder of the city was represented as the son or grandson of the Trojan hero. But reflexion showed that seven kings would not suffice to fill the space between Aeneas and the expulsion of the Tarquins. The kings of Alba were therefore interposed between Aeneas and Romulus. Names were procured for these kings, some derived from places near Alba, others 'conveyed' from the pages of Herodotus. Other legends, such as that of Evander's settlement on the Palatine hill, also played their part. Considering the doubtfulness of the elements of the problem, it is not surprising that different writers arrived at different dates for the origin of Rome. Timaeus, the Greek historian, imagined that Rome and Carthage were founded in the same year, 38 years before the first Olympiad, that is, in 814 B.C. For Fabius Pictor, the old annalist, the year of Rome's creation was 748-7; for Cincius Alimentus, 729-8; for Cato the Censor, (most probably) 745-4 B.C. It is possible that Cato was aided in his calculations by C. Sulpicius Gallus, the famous astronomer (consul in 166 B.C.), who worked out dates from traditional records of eclipses (Pliny, *N. H.* ii 13). It is known that Cato believed the Republic to have been established in 506 B.C., and reckoned the duration of the monarchy at 238 years. He also counted 432 years between the fall of Troy and the birth of Rome. The date assigned by Eratosthenes to the destruction of Troy came to be accepted by many, viz. 1183 B.C., and the deduction of 432 from this figure gave 751 B.C. as the date of Rome's foundation. This was accepted

Estimates of  
the age of the  
city.

by some annalists, and appeared in the Pontifical *annales* (Polybius ap. Dion. H. i 74). It thus became needful to extend the period of monarchy six years beyond the limit marked out by Cato.

135. At the end of the Republican period a thorough revision of Roman chronology was carried out by Cornelius Nepos, Atticus (the friend of Cicero), Varro, and others. For posterity Varro became almost the sole source of information. In a famous passage, Censorinus (*de die n.* 21) praises him for having attended to synchronisms with the history of other nations (*diuersarum ciuitatum tempora*), and eclipses and the intervals between them (*defectus eorumque interualla*). But Varro was a compiler rather than an investigator, and the work of other Romans, especially Atticus, had probably been more original, while still more had been achieved by Greek erudition. Cicero (*De Div.* ii 98) speaks of a friend of his, Tarutius Firmanus, who, 'relying chiefly on Chaldaean calculations', had fixed the true natal day of Rome as the 21st day of April, on which the festival of the *Parilia* was celebrated, and had ventured also to predict Rome's future destiny (*canere fata*). It is known that tradition told of a solar eclipse which coincided with the laying of the city's foundation stone, while another attended the death of the founder. The calculation of these and other eclipses contributed to establish the dates known as Varronian. The eclipse which signalised the reception of Romulus among the immortals was held to have occurred in July 717 B.C. According to a belief already established, he had reigned 37 years. The eclipse nearest to the beginning of this period gave the *Parilia* of 753 B.C. as the date of foundation; and the exile of King Tarquin was fixed for 509 B.C., which accorded with the opinion of the oldest annalist, Fabius Pictor. As the year 753 A.U.C. (*ab urbe condita*) is the year 1 B.C., and 754 A.U.C. is 1 A.D., it follows that to transfer a date A.U.C. into present reckoning we must, if it is smaller than 753, subtract its number from 754, which will give the date B.C., while if it is larger than 753, we must subtract from it the number 753, to arrive at the date A.D. (Astronomical reckoning makes a variation by interposing a year 0 between B.C. 1 and A.D. 1.) The so-called Varronian dates were generally, but not universally, accepted. The *Fasti Capitolini* treat the Monarchical period as embracing, not 244 years (as Varro supposed), but 243. Hence the foundation year of Rome becomes 752, not 753 B.C., while the date of the ejection of the Tarquins remains at 509 B.C.

136. Against the years 333, 324, 309, 301 B.C. there is the following note in the *Fasti Capitolini*: *hoc anno dictator et magister equitum sine cos. fuerunt*. The 'Chronographer of 354 A.D.' has against the first three years *hoc anno dictatores non fuerunt*, meaning by *dictatores* merely *magistratus*. (Holzapfel, *Röm. Chron.* p. 43.) The statement has appeared incredible because it has been supposed that the dictator was super-induced on the ordinary magistrates and did not displace them. But this may not have been so in the early days. In the *Fasti* the year 450 B.C. is occupied by Decemvirs along with

Various treatment of 333, 324, 309, 301 B.C.

consuls, while to 449 Decemvirs only were assigned. In other lists two years, or even three, were appropriated by Decemvirs. When the foundation year of the Republic was placed in 506, the four 'dictator-years' were left out, and the number of years given to consuls alone was increased by one; hence, between the *Fasti* and the other system, there was a difference of three years; *i.e.* the difference between 509 and 506. Both schemes assume that, during the five years from 375 to 371, the agitation of Licinius and Sextius prevented the election of magistrates. This again is not easy of credence.

137. In Diodorus a peculiar system is found. The eponymous magistrates for the five years 394—390 B.C. are repeated in the five years 389—385. The magistrates, who by other writers are represented as holding office in the five years 423—419, are altogether omitted; so are those of the 'dictator-years', while the period of anarchy is reduced from five years to one. The divergence between the scheme of Diodorus and the Varronian at some points amounts to nine years, and is never less than six or seven. Scholars have disagreed to a remarkable extent concerning the value of the chronological indications afforded by this writer, and the disagreement is likely to be perpetual. To some he will always appear a helpless blunderer, to others one who has preserved remnants of a truer chronology than is to be traced elsewhere. We cannot enter into the endless controversies to which the comparison between Diodorus and other sources has given occasion, but can only bring forward certain conspicuous considerations, of which all explanations and theories ought to take account.

Diodorus.

138. Looking to the working of the Republican magistracies as a whole, it is easy to see certain influences which tended to throw the *Fasti* into confusion. Where one of two consuls died during his year of office and was replaced by another for the rest of his term, there would be three consuls in the year, instead of two, and, as the fact that one was *suffectus* was easily forgotten, the annalist would be puzzled. Again, it sometimes happened that, when both consuls vacated office before completing their year, owing to death or resignation, their successors were not appointed to complete the time, but, on election, started a new year of office for themselves. (The disappearance of both consuls at the same time entailed also the resignation of other magistrates.) In this way the date of entry upon office was repeatedly shifted, and only in 153 B.C. was it finally fixed to the first day of *Ianuarius*. These causes operated to increase the number of consuls, in proportion to the years which had to be filled. So too there was a tendency, in family annals, to translate the consular tribunate, and perhaps, in its early days, the praetorship or even the curule aedileship into the consulship, as the higher office.

Causes of confusion.

139. On the other hand, some of the earliest consuls may, in various ways, have dropped out of memory. In some years a dictator extinguished their fame. It is obvious that those who first tried to compile *Fasti* must have practised adjustment, which,

Attempted adjustments.



in different hands, would produce varying results. There was an inevitable tendency to consider each Calendar year as having been occupied by one set of magistrates. Some of the accommodations are manifest in the pages of the historians. We find the same consuls assigned to different years, and, in years where there were military tribunes with consular authority, the number given varies from three to eight, whereas the normal number was six. In order to produce regularity, traditions of events which had no definite chronological attachments were made precise. Thus the traditions about the duration of the 'period of anarchy' and of the 'Decemviral government' were at first vague. The annalists assigned such definite terms of years as might best fit in with their chronological schemes, in which the Decemvirs were sometimes allowed one, sometimes two, sometimes three years, while sometimes one, sometimes four, sometimes five years were occupied by the *solitudo magistratuum*. The 'Chronographer of 354 A.D.' alone provides names for all these five years. The most common result of the accommodations carried out by annalists and chronographers was to leave a certain number of years without eponymous magistrates. This is not quite what might have been expected, and shows that the criticism applied to claims was more severe than is commonly supposed. But some names doubtless dropped out by accident. When two consuls should have been mentioned as bearing office at the beginning of a year, and two others as having entered on office in the course of the year, it was very easy for one pair of names to disappear. Names of families which became extinct would also tend to be excised as not genuine.

140. A particular theory for explaining the 'empty' years had so great an author, Niebuhr, and so long a vogue, that it deserves especial mention. He urged that the *interregna*, or periods during which no regular magistrates existed, should be taken into account, and that the sum of the *interregna* would produce the vacant years. But, if magistrates were elected merely to hold office during the part of a year which remained after the decease or resignation of their predecessors, the *interregnum* would have no effect on chronology. Further, the *interregnum* in early times is known to have lasted, as a rule, only a few days. If there had been long *interregna*, the accumulation of them would tend to lengthen out the duration of the Republic, and would produce a much greater dislocation of chronology than appears to have taken place. The records of early *interregna* are doubtless imperfect; but if, as is probable, they were mentioned in the pontifical *annales*, not much stress can be laid on this. As a matter of fact, the recorded *interregna* are insufficient to bear out Niebuhr's theory.

141. The chief practical use of a sound scheme of Roman chronology is to date, as precisely as may be, the events of Republican history, so as to correspond with the year as defined in the Calendar of Julius Caesar. The first necessity is to distinguish the Republican years in which intercalation was

Duration of the 'years of anarchy', and of the 'Decemviral government'.

Niebuhr's theory on the 'years of anarchy'.

Chief use of a sound system of Roman chronology.

made, from those in which no intercalation took place. Recent research has made it probable that the first 24-year cycle (§ 107) began on 1 March, 497, and that the Calendar did not fall into any great disorder before the time of the Second Punic War. The writers of the Imperial period thought otherwise; but the actual tests which can be applied, in consequence of indications of dates still on record, tend to prove them in error. A very few vague indications drawn from historians or from the *Fasti Triumphales* have been taken by Holzapfel and others as proof of dislocation, but they are insufficient to support the conclusion. The first great period of disorder appears to begin with the year 207 B.C., and the mistakes were not entirely corrected, by the operation of the *lex Acilia* of 191 (§ 112), until after the battle of Pydna. The first year in which we can discern complete correctness is 163 B.C. After that time there was no further dislocation until Caesar's day (§ 121).

142. The calculation of eclipses first becomes practically useful in the determination of the aberrations of the period 207—164 B.C. Cicero in his *De Republica*, i 25, quotes from Ennius and the *Annales Maximi* a reference to an eclipse of the sun, which, he says, had served as the basis for calculating earlier eclipses, back to that which had signalled the translation of Romulus to heaven. The original hand of the palimpsest (on which alone our knowledge of this work of Cicero depends) marks the date of the eclipse as the Nones of June, *quinquagesimo fere post Romam conditam*. A corrector (whose additions are often untrustworthy) added C C C, and this has led to the fixing of the date of the eclipse as 21 June, 400 B.C. From this assumed date many deductions have been made. But Unger is certainly right in supposing that the number given by Ennius was 550; and that the Varronian year 551 A.U.C. was indicated; the Nones in that year coincided with May 6, 203, in the Julian reckoning. This affords a valuable synchronism, fitting in with others that belong to the time. Livy, xxxvii 4, records another solar eclipse as having occurred on the 11th day of *Quinctilis*, 190 B.C. (Varron.); the natural date for this was the 14th of *Martius*. Thus the difference between true time and Calendar time was 125 days, and as there must have been some correction of the Calendar in this very year, in consequence of the *lex Acilia*, the difference in the preceding year must have been 147 or 148 days.

Evidence from eclipses.

143. This sum cannot be accounted for by any assumption of exact multiples of 22 or 23 days having been dropped out. The best explanation has been given by Unger, viz. that in 207 an attempt was made to introduce a year of 365 days, so that 10 days were added; but the scheme was for some reason abandoned. The attempt may have been induced partly by experience of misfortunes in the earlier part of the war, which had occurred during years when intercalation had taken place, partly by the new enthusiasm for Apollo, who would look with favour on the introduction of a Calendar year more in accord with the course of the sun. After 207

the experiment was discontinued, but superstition still prevented intercalation. To this period a statement by Macrobius, i 14, seems to refer: 'fuit tempus cum propter superstitionem intercalatio omnis omissa est'. The variations from year to year during the period of confusion (207—191) and the period of recovery (190 to 162 B.C.) are traced so far as is possible by Unger (§§ 77—82). There is good evidence that, from 163 down to Caesar's time, the Calendar was kept in good order, even during the years when the factions of Sulla and Marius were contending against each other.

144. Another principal difficulty in dating Republican events arises from the frequent shifting of the day for entry upon magistracies. This was finally fixed (excepting for the tribunate and quaestorship) at Jan. 1. How often the day had been changed, cannot of course be precisely determined. Some investigators allege thirty, others somewhere about twenty alterations. It is certain that from 222 to 153 B.C. the date was Id. Mart. The selection of Jan. 1 was probably intended to give the incoming magistrates who had to do with military affairs after their entry upon office, time to make preparations for taking the field at the period of the year when operations became possible.

145. Leaving the question of changes within the separate years, we come to the crucial difficulty of early Republican history, that of finding well-established points of departure for chronology. We can only give here a single specimen of the processes which have to be gone through, and of the obstacles which beset the attainment of definite results. We will take the date of the burning of Rome by the Gauls. This event must have made a noise among the Greek communities of Italy and Sicily, and some of its reverberations undoubtedly reached the Greeks of Greece proper, the Aegean and Asia Minor. Four Greek writers of the fourth century B.C. are recorded as having mentioned the catastrophe, Theopompus the historian, and the philosophers Theophrastus, Heracleides Ponticus, and Aristotle. The last-named knew of the delivery of Rome by Camillus. Yet the impediments which beset any effort to determine with precision the year in which the great event occurred, are considerable. Polybius (i 4) makes it contemporary with the peace of Antalcidas (387—6 B.C.), and presents this view as one that was in his day universally accepted (*ὁμολογουμένην καὶ γινωριζομένην ἀρχὴν παρ' ἅπασιν*),—an assertion borne out by other ancient writers. The general currency of the synchronism shows that it was determined by some recognised authority upon chronology, perhaps the astronomer Eratosthenes. What grounds he may have had for making the determination cannot be discovered with certainty. One reason may have lain in a tradition that, after plundering Rome, the Gauls came South and made an alliance with Dionysius the tyrant of Syracuse, who was then besieging Regium in the south of Italy. The sources of information as to

Changes in the day for entry on magistracies.

Difficulty of determining points of departure.

this siege have been the subject of much discussion, but on the whole they seem to point to the same date (387-6).

146. But at this point Polybius assumed 751-0 as the year of the foundation of Rome. The Varronian year was three years earlier; hence the Varronian date for the destruction of Rome would be 390—389 B.C. But a fresh difficulty arises because the very writers who accept the dating 387-6 proceed to inconsistencies. Thus Polybius in a later passage (ii 14—22) points to a different year. He there enumerates all the Gaulish inroads, with the intervals between them, in such a way as to imply that the burning of Rome occurred in 382-1. The exact amount of the discrepancy is a matter of controversy, and the explanation of it still more so. It has even been suspected that Polybius fell into error by misreading some numerals in a Latin source. A further vagary is Livy's assumption of the Varronian year 365 instead of 364 for the capture of Rome. Diodorus indicates the Varronian year as 363; but it is supposed that he confused the date of the Gaulish invasion of Etruria with that of the capture of the city. It is therefore not surprising to find that the estimates of the true date in recent times have wandered over all the years between 387 and 381 B.C. On the whole, 387 seems to have the weight of argument in its favour. There is a general agreement that no earlier date is possible. In the attempt to solve the problem, many records have been ransacked to furnish chronological indications. Only a few of the most prominent have been mentioned above.

147. We conclude with an examination of the meaning of the word *saeculum*, which has some importance both in history and in literature. The idea of recurring periods, at the end of which the community, by special service done to the gods, must rid itself of accumulated sin, would appear to be an old one in Italy. The most familiar example is that of the censorial *lustrum* at Rome. The term *saeculum* is defined by Censorinus as the extremest term of human life. This seems to have been taken at or about 100 years. In Livy, vii 3, we have an account (drawn from a contemporary antiquarian) of what at first sight seems to be a custom whereby *every year* an officer described as *praetor maximus* drove a nail into the wall of the *cella Iouis* on the Capitol. Mommsen has shown good reason for believing that the ceremony took place every hundred years, and that *praetor maximus* is a synonym for the *dictator clavi figendi causa*, who is recorded by the Capitoline *Fasti* as having been nominated in the Varronian years 391 and 291. The hammering of the nail had a magical effect in warding off evil. A similar ceremony was customary in the temple of Nortia at Volsinii in Etruria. As the passage in Livy is somewhat ambiguous, and another (viii 18) records that a nail was driven in by a dictator in the Varronian year 331, some scholars still hold that the ceremony was annual. However that may be, the existence of the custom shows that, even in the early years of the Republic, some careful records of passing time must have been kept.

The meaning  
of Saeculum.



148. A new significance was given to the *saeculum* by the initiation of the *ludi saeculares* amid the stress of the First Punic War in 249 B.C. These were connected with the propitiation of the realm of Shades and were held at first in honour of Dis Pater and Proserpina, the centre of the ceremony being an *ara Ditis* at a spot in the *Campus Martius* named *Tarentum*, whence the games themselves were called *Tarentini* or *Terentini*. The State vowed to repeat them every hundred years (Censorinus, xvii 8). The next celebration took place three years late, in 146 B.C. The ritual was Greek and was under the control of the Ministers of foreign cults, the College which became the 'Quindecimviri' in the time of Sulla. The idea of ridding the nation of its offences against heaven was from the first connected with the service. In 46, when the *ludi* should have been carried out for the third time, they were omitted. But a comparison between Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue*, written in 41 B.C., and Horace's *Carmen Saeculare*, makes it clear that Octavian, from the time when he reached power, contemplated a fresh celebration. This was postponed till 17 B.C. The ritual, still Greek in character, was greatly elaborated, and Augustus contrived to give a new tinge to the ceremony, laying stress not so much on its penitential aspect, as on the hope which the purification afforded of a happy age soon to begin. Large fragments of the minutes connected with this celebration came to light not long since, and contained a reference to Horace's hymn. This Augustan celebration rested on a new fiction which presumed a *saeculum* of 110 years, and a succession of four such *saecula*, bearing the names of metals. A new 'golden' age was about to begin. The celebration by Domitian in 88 A.D. was too early, according to the principles of Augustus; that of Septimius Severus in 204 kept near to the Augustan norm. Meanwhile, in 47 A.D., Claudius had instituted *ludi saeculares* which celebrated the 800th year of the existence of Rome; and these were continued in 147 and in 248.

The present knowledge of Roman chronology has been built up mainly by the researches of three modern scholars. The first is the celebrated Bibliography. Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540—1609), whose *De emendatione temporum* (published first in 1583) brought the light of the new astronomy of Tycho Brahé and Copernicus to bear upon problems of chronology, making use of the eclipses recorded in history. Equal, perhaps superior, to Scaliger in this department of scholarship, was L. Ideler (1766—1846) whose work entitled *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie* made its appearance in 1826, and has not yet been superseded. In more recent days this subject, like a hundred others connected with antiquity, has been deeply indebted to the great labours of Theodor Mommsen. His *Römische Chronologie* (second edition 1859) was called forth by certain works of his brother (August Mommsen) which needed refutation. Moreover, each of the three great scholars above named published other works of importance connected with this subject. The number of other writers of consequence is very considerable, and includes Sir Isaac Newton, Dodwell (*De Veteribus Graecorum Romanorumque cyclis*, Oxford 1701), and Clinton (*Fasti Romani*, 1845f). A list of works bearing on Roman chronology is given by

W. Soltau in the introduction to his *Römische Chronologie*. In this connexion the most important publications of Theodor Mommsen (apart from his *Römische Chronologie*) include his *Römische Forschungen*, and his disquisitions in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, on the Roman calendars and fragments of calendars which have survived from the Augustan age, on the fragments of the Capitoline *Fasti* and on those of the *Fasti Triumphales*. The recent literature of Roman chronology is of enormous extent. Fresh systems and combinations continually claim attention. Any one of these critical dissections may leave but small results behind it; but the progress made since the publication of Mommsen's *Römische Chronologie* has been considerable. The most useful recent writings have been those of W. Soltau (*Römische Chronologie*, 1889); L. Holzapfel (*Römische Chronologie*, 1885) and G. F. Unger (*Zeitrechnung der Griechen und Römer* in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Alterthums-Wissenschaft*, ed. 2, 1892). Of all recent investigators of this subject Unger has made the most strict use of evidence. Matzat's works, *Römische Chronologie* (1883) and *Römische Zeitrechnung von 219 B.C. bis 1 B.C.* (1889), bring together much material, but his conclusions have often been subjected to unfavourable criticism. The articles *Fasti* in the *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* of Daremberg and Saglio and in the *Real-Encyclopaedie* of Pauly-Wissowa contain much useful matter. The 'Chronographer of 354' has been edited by Th. Mommsen in the 'Chronica Minora', Vol. I.

## III 2. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

### 149. THE MONARCHY.

*Events connected with Literature or Art are printed in Italics.*

- B.C. 753 xi Kal. Mai. Rome founded.  
 753-673 Creation of Senate and Equites.  
 673-641 Destruction of Alba Longa.  
 641-616 Ostia taken from the Etruscans.  
 616-578 Tarquinius Priscus. Treaty with the Latins. Increase of Senate and Equites.  
 600 Date assigned to foundation of Massilia.  
 580 Earliest coins of the Italian Greeks.  
 579 Settlement at Lipāra of Rhodians and Cnidians driven out from Lilybaeum.  
 578-534 Servius Tullius. Murus and Agger constructed. Centurial organisation and local tribes (Sucusana or Suburana, Palatina, Esquilina, Collina) created. Between this time and 493 sixteen others came into existence.  
 550 Earliest Etruscan coinage, after Greek patterns.  
 537 Naval battle between the Phocaeen settlers at Alalia in Corsica and a fleet of Etruscan and Carthaginian vessels. The Etruscans occupy Corsica.  
 534-510 Tarquinius Superbus.  
 524 Defeat of Etruscans and barbarians at Cumae by Aristodemus.  
 511 Destruction of Sybaris.  
 510 The Tarquins ejected.

### 150. FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE REPUBLIC TO THE DECEMVIRATE.

- 509 Kal. Ian. The first consuls. Lex Valeria Horatia de prouocatione. The first treaty with Carthage, according to Polybius. Dedication of the temple of Iuppiter on the Capitol.  
 508 War with Porsena.  
 504 Migration of the Claudii to Rome.  
 501 The first dictator and magister equitum.  
 500 The Carthaginians conquer Sardinia about this time.  
 497 Battle of Lake Regillus. Temple of Saturnus in the forum.  
 495 Temple of Mercurius by the Circus Maximus.  
 494 First Secession and creation of the Tribune of the plebs. Foundation of Latin colonies at Velitrae and Suessa Pometia (among the Volsci). Creation of the twenty-first local tribe (Clustumina).  
 493 Treaty of Sp. Cassius with the Latins. Temple of Ceres, Liber and Libera by the Circus Maximus.  
 492 Lex Icilia as to the rights of Tribunes. Foundation of Latin colonies at Norba and Signia.  
 486 Treaty with the Hernici. Agrarian law of Sp. Cassius.  
 485 Condemnation of Sp. Cassius.  
 484 Temple of Castor in forum.  
 477 The Fabii at the Crēmēra.

- 474 Truce with Veii. Defeat of the Etruscans by Hiero at Cumae.  
 471 Lex Publilia Voleronis.  
 468-7 Antium taken from the Volsci and (Liv. ii 63) a Roman colony established there.  
 466 Temple of Deus Fidius.  
 462 Agitation begun by C. Terentilius Arsa, a tribune, to appoint a commission of five to draw up laws limiting the consular imperium.  
 460 Capture of the Capitol by the Sabine Appius Herdonius.  
 457 The number of plebeian tribunes raised to ten.  
 456 Lex Icilia de Aventino publicando.  
 454 Triumph of the agitation of Arsa. Mission of inquiry to Athens. Lex Aternia Tarpeia de multis.  
 452 A Syracusan force lays waste the Etruscan and Corsican coasts and occupies Aethalia (Elba).  
 451 'Decemviri legibus scribendis' (all patricians) supersede all the magistrates and publish ten 'tabulae' of laws, accepted by the comitia centuriata.  
 450 Second body of Decemviri (partly plebeian), who decline to abdicate at the end of the year. They publish two additional 'tabulae'.  
 440 Trial of Verginia. Second Secession. Abdication and exile of the Decemvirs. Renewal of the magistracies. Leges Valeriae Horatiae. Lex Icilia (indemnity for Secession).

#### 151. FROM THE FALL OF THE DECENVIRS TO THE CAPTURE OF VEII.

- 448 Lex Trebonia (to stop co-optation of tribunes).  
 447 Appointment of two quaestors by comitia tributa. Great defeat of the Tarentines by the Iapyges.  
 446 Arbitration by Rome between Aricia and Ardea.  
 445 Lex Canuleia. Institution of the 'tribuni militares consulari potestate' to take the place of consuls in such years as the Senate might determine. Plebeians eligible.  
 443 Censorship created, open to patricians only. Latin colony founded at Ardea.  
 442 Allotment of land at Ardea ('assignatio uirritana').  
 439 Sp. Maelius condemned.  
 438-5 War with Fidenae. 'Spolia opima' of A. Cornelius Cossus.  
 434 Lex Aemilia, restricting censors (elected every five years) to a tenure of a year and a half.  
 432 First law to check malpractice at elections.  
 431 First temple of Apollo.  
 430 Lex Iulia Papiria 'de multarum aestimatione'.  
 424 Capua taken from the Etruscans by the Samnites.  
 421 Quaestorships increased to four and opened to plebeians.  
 420 Cumae captured by Samnites.  
 418 Allotment of land at Labici.  
 415 Three Etruscan ships aid the Athenians at Syracuse.  
 410 The Carthaginians in Sicily.  
 409 The first plebeian quaestor.  
 406-396 War with Veii. The 'equites equo priuato' introduced. Pay first given to the troops.  
 403 Camillus as censor imposes a tax on bachelors ('aes uxorium').  
 400 The earliest 'tribuni militares consulari potestate' who were plebeians.  
 398 Embassy to Delphi.  
 397 The Etruscans attacked by Gauls.  
 396 Veii captured. Temple of Mater Mātūta.



## 152. FROM THE CAPTURE OF VEII TO THE LATIN WAR.

- 395 Treaty with Massilia.
- 394 Triumph of Camillus. Gifts sent to Delphi.
- 393 Allotment of land at Veii. Latin colony founded at Circeii.
- 392 Temple of Iuno Regina on the Aventine.
- 391 Camillus exiled. Clusium asks for aid against the Gauls.
- 390 Battle at the Allia. Camillus recalled. His victory over the Gauls known to Aristotle (*Plut. Cam.* 22).
- 388 Temple of Mars 'extra portam Capenam'.
- 389 (or 387) Four new local tribes created in southern Etruria (Stellatina, Tromentina, Sabatina, Arnensis). The tribes now number 25.
- 387 Dionysius of Syracuse founds settlements on both sides of the Adriatic (including Ancona and Hatria).
- 385 Dionysius plunders the Etruscan port of Pyrgi. Latin colony founded at Satricum.
- 384 M. Manlius condemned. New Latin towns no longer admitted to the League.
- 383 Foundation of the Latin colony at Sutrium in Etruria.
- 382 (or 372) Latin colony founded at Setia.
- 381 Capture of Tusculum, which receives the 'ciuitas'.
- 380 Antium and Tarracina become Latin colonies about this time.
- 377 The tribunes C. Licinius Stolo and L. Sextius begin their agitation.
- 375-1 No ordinary magistrates elected (cp. § 136).
- 375 Temple of Iuno Lucina in the Esquiliae.
- 373 Foundation of the Latin colony at Nĕpĕtē in Etruria.
- 368 The first plebeian *magister equitum*. Law to admit plebeians to the college of keepers of the Sibylline books, and to increase the number to ten. The laws of Licinius and Sextius passed.
- 367 First plebeian consul, L. Sextius. Creation of the praetorship (open to patricians only) and of two *curule aedileships*, to be filled in alternate years by patricians and plebeians. The Gauls at Alba. Temple of Concordia in the forum.
- 365 Death of Camillus.
- 364 The first 'ludi scenici'.
- 362 The *tribuni militum*, formerly all nominated by consuls, now in part elected by the *comitia tributa*. M. Curtius leaps into the lake.
- 361 The Gauls (aided by Latins) three miles from Rome.
- 360 Fight with Gauls close to Rome.
- 358 Two new local tribes (Pomptina and Publilia) created in Southern Latium, bringing the number up to 27. Renewed treaty with the Latins. The Gauls defeated. *Lex Poetelia de ambitu*.
- 357 'Lex de uicesima manumissionum' passed 'in castris tributim' by the consul Cn. Manlius. Law regulating interest.
- 356 The first plebeian dictator, C. Marcius Rutilus, is refused a triumph.
- 355-342 In several of these years both consuls were patricians.
- 354 Alliance with the Samnites.
- 353 (or 351) The first 'ciuitas sine sufragio' (Caere). The *lex Quinia* (possibly about this time).
- 352 Severe financial crisis.
- 351 The first plebeian Censor.
- 350 The Gauls on the Alban mount.
- 349 Victory over Gauls and Latins. Raids by Greek vessels on the Italian coast.
- 348 Treaty with Carthage (called the earliest by Diodorus).
- 347 Renewed financial stress.
- 345 Occupation of Sora on the Liris.

- 344 Temple of Iuno Mōnēta on the Capitol.
- 343-1 First Samnite war, in support of the Campanians.
- 342 Military mutiny. Plebiscita to abolish interest, to forbid the holding of the same magistracy twice within ten years, and of two magistracies in the same year, and to require that one consul should be plebeian, the other place also being open to plebeians.
- 340 Treaty with the Samnites.

### 153. LATIN AND SAMNITE WARS.

- 340-338 War with Latins. Victories 'ad Vesperim', and at Trifanum.
- 339 Leges Publiliae Philonis.
- 338 Dissolution of the Latin League. Many Latins and Campanians become 'ciues sine suffragio'. Antium becomes a Roman citizen colony. The 'rostra' from Antium used to decorate speakers' platform. Archidāmos the Spartan suffers defeat at the hands of the Lucani, on the day on which the battle of Chaeronea took place.
- 337 The first plebeian praetor.
- 336-4 The 'Ausōnes' defeated; Cales captured, and Latin colony founded there.
- 335 A rising of slaves.
- 332 Friendship with Alexander of Molossus, who is killed in this year at Pandosia. Two new local tribes (Maecia and Scaptia) created. The whole number is now 29.
- 329 Capture of Priuernum. Tarracina becomes a Roman citizen colony.
- 328 Latin colony founded at Fregellae.
- 327-304 Second Samnite war, in which other Italian peoples join. League of Rome with the Lucanians.
- 327 First instance of 'prorogatio imperii'. Siege of Neapolis by the Romans.
- 326 Lex Poetelia de nexis, diminishing the rigour of the law of debt (or in 313). Treaty with Neapolis.
- 324 The people of Croton, with the aid of Syracuse, defeat the Bruttii.
- 322 Overtures for peace, made by the Samnites, declined by Rome.
- 321 The defeat at the 'Furculae Caudinae'.
- 320 Luceria and Fregellae captured by the Samnites. The Tarentines attempt to arbitrate between the Romans and Samnites.
- 319 Luceria retaken by the Romans.
- 318 Surrender of the Apuli and some other peoples. The 'praelecti Capuam Cumas' now first appointed. Two new local tribes created in the northern Campanian territory (Oufentina and Falerna). These are the thirtieth and thirty-first.
- 316 Nuceria, Nola and Sora join the Samnites.
- 314 War against Aurunci. Latin colony founded at Luceria. Sora and Nola recovered. End of a war between Syracuse and Carthage.
- 313 Latin colonies founded at Suessa Aurunca, and on the island of Pontiae, and at Saticula (in Samnium). Fregellae recaptured.
- 312 Censorship of Ap. Claudius Caecus. All the military tribunes of the first four legions now elected. 'Duouiri navales' first created. Construction of the uia Appia to Capua, and of the 'aqua Claudia'.
- 311 War with the Etruscans.
- 310 The Romans pass the 'silua Ciminia' for the first time. Victory at lake Vadimo. Some Etruscan cities make peace. First recorded naval expedition of the Romans. Agathocles of Syracuse receives the support of Etruscan ships against the Carthaginians.
- 308 War with the Umbrians, and their surrender. Peace with the remaining cities of Etruria.

- 307 Expedition of a Roman squadron to Corsica. First 'prorogatio imperii' by Senate.
- 306 Peace with the Hernici (most of whom become 'ciues sine suffragio'). New treaty with Carthage. Arrangement with Rhodes; and a little later with Apollonia.
- 304 Submission of the Aequi. Peace with the Samnites and Marrucini, Marsi, Paeligni, Frentani. Censorship of Q. Fabius Rullianus, who (undoing the work of Appius Claudius) restricts the landless citizens to the four city tribes.
- 303 Latin colony founded at Alba Fucensis. Alliance with Tarentum.
- 303 Expedition of Cleonymus the Spartan to Italy. He is defeated by the Sallentini with help from Rome.
- 302 Painting of the temple of Salus on the Capitol by Gaius Fabius.
- 301 War with the Marsi and Etruscans. Peace with the Vestini.
- 300 War with the Aequi. Lex Valeria de prouocatione (rendering the dictator subject to the prouocatio). Lex Ogulnia, increasing the numbers of the augurs and pontifices and admitting plebeians to these colleges. The thirty-second and thirty-third local tribes (Aniensis and Teretina) are created, on the upper waters of the Anio and Liris. The first 'tonsor' comes from Sicily to Ardea.
- 299 Latin colony founded at Narnia. Occupation of Corcyra by Agathocles; the island ceded to Pyrrhus four years later.
- 298-290 Third Samnite war, in which Etruscans, Apuli, Umbrians, Gauls ultimately join. Latin colony founded at Carsedii.
- 298 New treaty with the Lucani. Capture of Bouianum. Successes in Samnium recorded in the oldest of the 'Scipionum elogia'.
- 296 Institution of the worship of Pudicitia Plebeia. Minturnae and Sinuessa become Roman citizen colonies. The statue of the she-wolf and the twins set up on the Capitol. Temple of Bellona near the 'circus Flaminius'.
- 295 Self-devotion of Decius, and victory over the Samnites and their allies at Sentinum. Temple of Iuppiter Victor. Temple of Venus by the Circus Maximus.

#### 154. FROM THE END OF THE SAMNITE WARS TO THE FIRST PUNIC WAR.

- 294 Surrender of chief Etruscan towns. Temple of Victoria and of Iuppiter Stator on the Palatine.
- 293 Temples of Quirinus and Fors Fortuna. Colossal Iuppiter set up in Capitol.
- 293 Insurrection at Falerii.
- 291 Latin colony founded at Venusia. Temple of Aesculapius on the 'insula Tiberina'.
- 290 Treaty with Samnites. Surrender of Sabines, who had revolted. They become 'ciues sine suffragio'.
- 289 'Tresuiri capitales' (or 'nocturni') first appointed. Latin colony founded at Ilatia. Death of Agathocles.
- 287 Fourth and last 'Secessio'. Lex Hortensia. Severe financial stress.
- 286 Lex Maenia. About this time some of the 'ciuitates sine suffragio', including Tusculum, receive the full Roman franchise.
- 285 Thurii attacked by the Lucanians. War with Etruscans, Umbrians and Gauls.
- 283 War with the *Σηπώνες* (Polybius), ending in their complete destruction. Sena Gallica (in Umbria) and Castrum Nouum (in Picenum) established as Roman citizen colonies. Defeat of Etruscans.
- 232 War with Boii, ended by a treaty. Risings in Samnium, Lucania and Bruttium. Occupation of Thurii, Regium, Croton, Locri. The Tarentines attack a Roman fleet.

- 281 War with Tarentum and Pyrrhus, in which some Italian peoples of the south take part. Etruscans again defeated.
- 280 Battle of Heraclea. For the first time, a plebeian censor conducts the 'lustrum'.
- 279 Syracuse joins Pyrrhus. Battle of Asculum. New treaty with Carthage.
- 278 Treaty with Heraclea and departure of Pyrrhus for Sicily. Victories over his allies. Temple of Summanus.
- 276 Return of Pyrrhus, after victories in Sicily.
- 275 Hiero supreme at Syracuse. Battle of Beneventum and departure of Pyrrhus to Epirus. Censors eject from the Senate an ex-consul, for the possession of silver plate.
- 273 Embassy from Ptolemy Philadelphus. Latin colonies founded at Cosa (in Campania or in Etruria?) and at Paestum.
- 272 Surrender of Tarentines and other enemies in S. Italy. The poet Livius Andronicus brought as prisoner from Tarentum to Rome. Death of Pyrrhus in Greece. Temple of Consus on the Aventine.
- 271 Capture of Regium from Campanians, who had deserted from the Roman army.
- 270—266 War with Umbrians, Picentes, Sallentini, ending with their surrender. Capture of Brundisium. Rome supreme in Italy.
- 268 Latin colonies founded at Ariminum and at Beneventum, with somewhat diminished rights. The 'ius Arimini' is applied to all subsequent Latin colonies, down to the foundation of the last in 181. Centralisation of silver coinage at Rome. Institution of 'tresviri monetales'. First recorded divorce. Temple of Tellus. Enfranchisement of Sabines.
- 267 Four 'quaestores classici' appointed; one stationed at Ostia, another at Cales, a third at Ariminum. Temple of Pales.
- 265 Treaty with the Mamertini of Messana.

### 155. FIRST PUNIC WAR.

- 264 Volsinii (which had fallen into the hands of the lowest class) captured. The First Punic war begins with the capture of Messana, which had been occupied by Italian mercenaries of Agathocles (Mamertini) and surrendered by them to the Carthaginians. The first exhibition of gladiators at Rome (introduced from Etruria). Latin colony founded at Firinum (in Picenum). Temple of Vortumnus on the Aventine.
- 263 Hiero of Syracuse joins the Romans, who win over several Sicilian cities. Latin colony founded at Aesernia (in Samnium). The first sundial at Rome.
- 262 Agrigentum captured. *Timaïos completes his history.*
- 260 Naval victory of C. Duilius at Mylae. First naval triumph, celebrated by the 'columna rostrata'. Temple of Janus near the site of the theatre of Marcellus.
- 259 Roman successes in Corsica and Sardinia. Temple of the 'Tempestates' by the 'Porta Capena'.
- 258 Temple of Spes 'in foro holitorio'.
- 256 Expedition of Regulus to Africa. Naval victory at Ecnomus.
- 255 Defeat of Regulus by the Carthaginians, under Xanthippus. Destruction of Roman fleet by storm at Pachynus.
- 254 Capture of Panormus. Temple of Fides in the Capitol.
- 253 Another Roman fleet destroyed by storm.
- 252 The first plebeian pontifex maximus (Tib. Coruncanius). Capture of Himëra and Lîpāra. Refusal of the equites to work with the 'gregarii milites' at the trenches.
- 251 Great victory at Panormus (on land).
- 249 The fleet under P. Claudius defeated at Drepana after his contemptuous treatment of the 'sacred chickens'. A large fleet of Roman transports destroyed by storm. The first recorded 'ludi saeculares'.



- 243 Hamilcar Barca in Sicily.  
 247 Birth of Hannibal. Roman citizen colonies founded at Aesium in Umbria and Alsium in Etruria.  
 245 Roman citizen colony founded at Fregenae in Etruria.  
 244 Hamilcar at Eryx. Latin colony established at Brundisium.  
 242 Great naval victory of Lutatius Catulus at the 'insulae Aegâtes'. The Carthaginians sue for peace. The office of 'praetor peregrinus' created.  
 241 Peace with Carthage. The ceded parts of Sicily constitute the first Roman province. Rebellion of the Falisci. Two new tribes created (Velina and Quirina), completing the full number of thirty-five. Conjectured date of the changed order of voting in the 'comitia centuriata'. Latin colony founded at Spolegium. Temple of Iuno Curitis.

# 156. FROM THE END OF THE FIRST TO THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND PUNIC WAR.

- 240 *First play of Livius Andronicus.* War of Carthaginian mercenaries begins.  
 239 *Birth of Ennius.* The Romans take over Corsica and (in 238) Sardinia at the invitation of the mutineers against Carthage.  
 238 War with Gauls of northern Italy and with the Ligurians. Temple of Flora.  
 237 Hamilcar crosses to Spain and makes conquests there.  
 235 *First dramas of Naevius performed.*  
 234 Birth of Cato the Censor.  
 233 Temple of Honos before the 'Porta Capena'.  
 232 Law of C. Flaminius to divide the 'ager Gallicus' and 'Picēnus'.  
 231 The Corsi, with whom the Sardinians the Romans had been contending for seven years, make a surrender. First recorded triumph of a Roman general on the 'mons Albanus'. Export of silver to the Celtic lands forbidden.  
 230 War against the Illyrian pirates.  
 229 Hasdrubal succeeds Hamilcar in Spain. The 'uictoriatus' first coined about this time.  
 228 Peace in Illyria. Roman garrisons in Corcyra, Apollonia and a few other places. Roman envoys received with distinction in Greece. Supposed date of compact between Rome and Hasdrubal, binding the Romans not to cross the river Ibērus in war (*ἐπὶ πολέμῳ* in Polybius).  
 227 The number of praetors raised to four, two of whom are allotted to govern the two provinces, the Roman portion of Sicily and Sardinia with Corsica.  
 226 Great combination of Gauls of N. Italy with Transalpine allies, against Rome.  
 225 Great defeat of Gauls near Pisae (battle of Telamon).  
 224 Surrender of the Boii.  
 223 An army under C. Flaminius and his colleagues crosses the Po for the first time and defeats the Insubres.  
 222 The consul M. Claudius Marcellus wins the 'spolia opima' in fight with the Insubres, who surrender. From this year to 153, Id. Mart. is the day for magistrates (excepting tribunes and quaestors) to enter on office.  
 221 Hasdrubal assassinated; Hannibal succeeds. Roman victory over the Histri.  
 220 Censorship of C. Flaminius. Construction of the 'uia Flaminia' to Ariminum, and of the 'circus Flaminius'. Philip V becomes king of Macedon.  
 219 Second Illyrian war. Condemnation of one consul, M. Livius Salinator, for malversation; the other, L. Aemilius Paulus, just escapes. Capture of Saguntum by Hannibal. Lex Claudia passed (restraining Senators and their sons from maritime trade). The first Greek physician (Archagathos) in Rome.

## 157. SECOND PUNIC WAR.

- 218 Latin colonies founded at Placentia and Cremona. Hannibal's march to Italy. The consul P. Cornelius Scipio misses Hannibal at the Rhone; sends his forces to Spain, returns to Italy and is defeated at the Ticinus by the Carthaginians. His colleague Ti. Sempronius Longus joins him and both are defeated at the Trebia.
- 217 C. Flaminius defeated at the 'Iacus Trasumennus'. For the first time a dictator (or rather pro-dictator) viz. Q. Fabius Maximus is elected by the comitia and also his 'magister equitum' M. Minucius Rufus. The latter has afterwards equal authority with Fabius, bestowed on him by the comitia. Successful operations of the two Scipiones in Spain. The As reduced to two unciae.
- 216 The consuls C. Terentius Varro and L. Aemilius Paulus defeated at Cannae. Many Italian peoples join Hannibal. Q. Fabius Pictor the annalist is Roman envoy to Delphi. Death of Hiero. Hannibal seizes Capua and winters there. Temple of Concordia on the Capitol. First recorded instance of the summoning of the Senate by a tribune.
- 215 Treaty between Hannibal and Philip of Macedon. Success of Marcellus at Nola. Sumptuary law of C. Oppius. Temple of Mars and of Venus Erucina on the Capitol.
- 214 Casilinum captured by the Romans. Siege of Syracuse by Marcellus begins. Naval operations against Philip. Successes of the Scipiones in Spain. Possible date of the 'plebiscitum Atinium'.
- 212 Hannibal captures Tarentum, and the Romans storm Syracuse. Marcellus defeats Carthaginians at Agrigentum. Defeat and death of the Scipio brothers in Spain.
- 211 Surrender of Capua to the Romans. The Campani lose their 'ciuitas sine suffragio'. Alliance with the Aetoli. The comitia bestow on P. Cornelius Scipio (aged 24) the command in Spain, with proconsular imperium. This is the first attested example of this privilege being conferred on a 'priuatus'.
- 210 Agrigentum taken; the Carthaginians evacuate Sicily. Marcellus holds his own against Hannibal in Lucania. Scipio captures Noua Carthago. *L. Cincius Alimentus the annalist is praetor in Sicily.*
- 209 Hasdrubal, son of Hamilcar, defeated at Baecula. Chequered fortunes of Hannibal in Apulia. Q. Fabius (Cunctator) recaptures Tarentum. Twelve of the thirty Latin colonies declare themselves unable to meet the demands of the Roman government. First plebeian 'curio maximus'.
- 208 Marcellus and his colleague are entrapped by Hannibal and killed. The 'ludi Apollinares', instituted in 212, are made annual.
- 207 Hasdrubal defeated at the Metaurus by the consuls C. Claudius Nero and M. Livius Salinator. Continued successes in Spain and Greece. *Livius Andronicus writes a hymn of praise for victory. Establishment of the 'schola poetarum' in the temple of Minerva on the Aventine.*
- 206 Surrender of the Lucani. Alliance with Gades in Spain. Scipio's return to Rome.
- 205 Scipio made consul, and given permission to go to Africa, captures Locri on the way. Mago, Hannibal's brother, occupies Genua. The Aetoli make peace with Philip, and the Romans also afterwards. Temple of Honos and Virtus before the 'Porta Capena'.
- 204 Scipio in Africa, with M. Cato as quaestor. Lex Cincia 'de donis et muneribus'. Establishment of the cult of the Magna Mater.
- 203 Hannibal recalled to Africa. Mago defeated and killed in Gaul. Successes of Scipio.
- 202 Battle of Zama.

- 201 Peace and triumph of Scipio. War goes on in northern Italy, kept alive by a Carthaginian, Hamilcar. New alliance with Aetoli. S. Aelius Paetus, author of the 'ius Aelianum', is consul.

### 158. FROM THE END OF THE SECOND PUNIC TO THE END OF THE SYRIAN WAR.

- 200 Second Macedonian war. Insurrection of Gauls. *The 'Stichus' of Plautus performed.*
- 199 Romans defeated by the Insubres.
- 198 Flaminius drives Philip into Thessaly. Alliance with the Achaean league. Peace with Insubres. Slave rising in Latium.
- 197 Victory of Cynoscephalae. Conjectural date of first lex Porcia. Praetorships raised to six.
- 196 Peace concluded with Philip. Flaminius proclaims the 'freedom of Greece' at the Isthmian games. Peace with Cenomāni. Serious slave insurrection.
- 195 Antiochus, called on to free the Greek cities under his rule, and to refrain from crossing into Europe, refuses. Operations against Nabis the Spartan despot. Lex Oppia repealed. Cato in Spain; he is the first 'nouus homo' to obtain the consulship since 216. Flight of Hannibal from Carthage. Second 'lex Porcia' (possibly).
- 194 Second consulship of Scipio Africanus, who assigns separate seats to senators at *ludi*. Roman forces withdrawn from Greece. Roman citizen colonies founded at Puteoli, Volturnum, Liternum, Salernum, Buxentum, Sipontum, Tempa and Croton, and possibly at Pyrgi (before 191). Temples of Veïōis and of Faunus in the 'insula Tiberina'; and of Iuno Sospita 'in foro holitorio'. Lex Aebutia restricting 'legis actiones' (possibly). *Probable date of death of Naevius.*
- 193, 2, 1 War continues against the Gauls and Ligurians.
- 193 Latin colony of Copia founded on the site of Thurii. Defeat of Boii. Temple of Victoria Virgo on the Palatine.
- 192 Latin colony of Valentia founded at Vibo (in Bruttium).
- 191 Antiochus, invited by the Aetolians, enters Greece, and is defeated by M' Acilius Glabrio at Thermopylae, where Cato served as military tribune. The Aetoli, hard pressed, obtain a truce. Temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine and institution of the 'ludi Megalenses' (wrongly said by Livy xxxvi 36 to be the earliest 'ludi scenici'). Lex Acilia concerning the Calendar.
- 190 L. Cornelius Scipio, brother of Africanus, with Africanus for his legatus, wins a great victory over Antiochus at Magnesia. (Hannibal had joined Antiochus.)
- 189 Peace with Antiochus. The new consul, Cn. Manlius Vulso, makes war on the Galatae without authorisation and suffers severely. Capture of Ambracia from the Aetoli by the other consul M. Fulvius Nobilior (in whose camp was the poet Ennius). 'Deditio' of Aetoli. Latin colony established at Bononia. L. Aemilius Paulus in Spain.

### 159. FROM THE END OF THE SYRIAN TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE THIRD MACEDONIAN WAR.

- 188 Fundi, Formiae and Arpinum receive the full franchise. The 'ciues sine suffragio' cease to exist. Disastrous march of Cn. Manlius through Thrace.
- 187 Trial of the Scipios for malversation. Africanus retires to Liternum. A decree ejects from Rome Latins who had settled there without right. From this year on the wars in Liguria and Spain are continuous for a long period. Via Aemilia made from Ariminum to Placentia.
- 186 The 'Bacchanalian conspiracy'; drastic punishments.

- 185 Death of Africanus (according to Cic. *Cato Mai.* 6; but in the next year according to Livy). The Senate prohibits the building of a permanent theatre.
- 184 Censorship of Cato. Death of Hannibal. *Death of Plautus*. Third lex Porcia (possibly). Roman citizen colonies founded at Potentia (in Picenum) and Pisaurum (in Umbria). Basilica Porcia built.
- 183 Roman citizen colonies founded at Parma and Mutina, and at Saturnia in Etruria.
- 182 Senate checks Ti. Sempronius Gracchus who, as aedile, exacted contributions from the allies for his *ludi*.
- 181 Lex Cornelia Baebia de ambitu. Lex Baebia, restricting the praetorships to four in alternate years. Roman citizen colony founded at Grauscae in Etruria. The last of the Latin colonies established at Aquileia. Decree of the Senate requires the killing of 5000 enemies as a condition of a triumph.
- 180 Lex Villia annalis. Roman citizen colony founded at Luna in Etruria; refounded three years later. Transportation of Ligurians to Samnium ('Ligures Cornelianii' and 'Baebiani').
- 179 Temples of Diana and Iuno Regina by the 'Circus Flaminius'. Death of Philip.
- 177 Lex Claudia to eject from Rome the *socii* who had settled there without right. Ligurians settled near Luna ('Ligures Apuani').
- 175 Ti. Gracchus subjugates the Sardi, after three campaigns.
- 174 Lex Voconia 'de mulierum hereditatibus' (supported by Cato). *The cost of stage plays taken over by the State*.
- 173 Embassies from Greeks to Rome and from Rome to Greece (numerous about this time). Envoys sent to arbitrate between Masinissa and Carthage. *Two Epicurean philosophers expelled from Rome*. Temple of Fortuna Equestris.

## 160. FROM THE THIRD MACEDONIAN TO THE THIRD PUNIC WAR.

- 172 Two plebeian consuls for the first time.
- 171 War with Perseus, king of Macedon. Ill success of the Romans in the first three campaigns. Carteia in Spain receives the 'Latinitas' (the first example).
- 169 *Death of Ennius*. Crates of Mallos reaches Rome from Pergamum 'sub ipsam Ennii mortem', and lectures on 'Grammar'. Quarrel with Rhodes.
- 168 L. Aemilius Paulus, consul, wins the great battle of Pydna. The Illyrian and Epirote allies of Perseus are also beaten. *Death of the dramatist Caecilius Statius*. Temple of 'Fortuna huiusce diei' on the Palatine.
- 167 Macedonia divided into four protectorates. At this time the 'tributum' ceased to be exacted from the Roman citizen. Polybius, one of 1000 Achaean prisoners, brought to Rome.
- 166 *The 'Andria' of Terence exhibited at the 'ludi Megalenses'*. The 'ager Campanus' regulated.
- 164 Perseus dies at Alba. Reconciliation between Rhodes and Rome.
- 163 Ptolemy Philometor, ejected from Egypt, is a suppliant for Roman aid.
- 161 *Greek philosophers and rhetoricians expelled from Rome*. The independence of the Jews recognised by the Senate about this time.
- 160 *The 'Adelphi' of Terence exhibited*.
- 157 Cato having been sent as one of an embassy to mediate between Carthage and Masinissa, begins his denunciations of Carthage. Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, ejected from his kingdom, seeks Roman aid. Roman citizen colony founded at Auximum (in Picenum).
- 156 War in Dalmatia. The lex Aelia and lex Fufia.
- 155 *Diogenes the Stoic, Critolaus the Peripatetic and Carneades the Academic visit Rome as envoys from Athens and give lectures in philosophy and rhetoric*.



- 154 Ligurians who had been laying waste the territory of Massilia were attacked, and a Roman force operated to the West of the Alps for the first time (with the exception of the landing at the Rhone in 218); also the *lex Licinia* and *lex Aebutia* (forbidding the proposer of a law and his kin to fill an office created by the law) were passed about this time.
- 153 Kal. Ian. henceforth is the time for the magistrates (excepting the tribunes and quaestors) to enter on office. The tribunes' day was Dec. 10; the quaestors' Dec. 5. Romans defeated by the Celtiberi.
- 151 Surrender of a Roman army to the Lusitani. War between Carthage and Masinissa. Roman embassy to Africa. Temple of Felicitas in the Velabrum.

# 161. FROM THE THIRD PUNIC WAR TO THE TRIBUNATE OF TI. GRACCHUS.

- 150 Law forbidding the consulship to be held twice by the same man. War declared against Carthage. Surrender of Utica.
- 149 The severe demands of the Romans force the Carthaginians to continue the war. Viriathus, the Lusitanian leader, wins many successes against the Romans in this and the following years, to 141. War with Andriscus, the pretended son of Perseus in Macedonia. Death of Cato and of Masinissa. Ludi Saeculares at Rome. *Lex Calpurnia de repetundis* establishes the first 'quaestio perpetua'.
- 148 Poor success of the Romans in Africa. The Via Postumia, from Genua to Verona, constructed. Andriscus overcome.
- 147 P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus as consul besieges Carthage. War with the Achaean.
- 146 Destruction of Carthage and establishment of the Roman province of Africa. Corinth destroyed by Mummius. Achaia and Macedonia form another province. Temple of Iuppiter Stator in the 'circus Flaminius'.
- 145 Attempt to pass a law, submitting the priests of the great colleges to popular election, is foiled by C. Laelius. In this year (probably) C. Laelius introduced an agrarian law and earned the title 'Sapiens' by withdrawing it. Splendid *ludi* (including *scenici*) exhibited by L. Mummius.
- 144 The 'aqua Marcia' introduced into the city.
- 143 Wanton attack by Ap. Claudius (consul) on the Salassi. He triumphs in spite of Senate and people.
- 142 'Pseudophilippus' crushed in Macedonia. Censorship of P. Scipio Aemilianus and L. Mummius. Journey of Scipio to the East. Fabius Maximus Seruilianus the annalist is consul.
- 140 Peace on equal terms made by Fabius Maximus with Viriathus. Q. Pompeius makes a treacherous peace with the Numantines. Q. Seruilius, brother of Fabius and consul, breaks the peace. Viriathus assassinated at the instance of Q. Seruilius. Birth of L. Antonius Crassus the orator.
- 139 The treaty with Numantia repudiated and war continued. Rising of slaves in Sicily. *Lex Gabinia*, the first of the Roman ballot laws. *Expulsion of 'Chaldaei' from Rome*.
- 138 Roman defeat by the Numantines. A consul placed in chains by a tribune. Birth of Sulla. Valentia in Spain receives the 'Latinitas'. Temple of Mars in the Campus Martius.
- 137 *Lex Cassia tabellaria*, the second ballot-law. C. Hostilius Mancinus makes peace with the Numantines, to save his army, in which Ti. Gracchus was serving. The Senate repudiate the peace and offer to surrender Mancinus to the Numantines.
- 136 The proconsul M. Aemilius Lepidus, having suffered defeat in Spain, is stripped of his 'imperium'.

- 135 Great slave rising in Sicily.  
 134 Scipio besieges Numantia. In his suite were Iugurtha, Marius and *Lucilius the satirist*.

## 162. THE AGE OF THE GRACCHI.

- 133 Tribune of Ti. Gracchus, his 'lex agraria' and destruction by a rabble of optimates, headed by P. Scipio Nasica who for safety's sake takes a mission to Asia. Scipio Aemilianus captures Numantia. Attalus III, last king of Pergamon, bequeaths to Rome his realm, of which part becomes the Roman province of Asia. The annalist L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi is consul.  
 132 Triumph of Scipio Aemilianus. Rising of Aristonicus in Asia. P. Licinius Crassus, father-in-law of C. Gracchus, fills the vacant place on the agrarian commission, the other two members being C. Gracchus and Ap. Claudius, father-in-law of Ti. Gracchus. The Senate empowers the consuls to arraign and punish the adherents of Ti. Gracchus. Death of Scipio Nasica in Asia. Triumph of D. Brutus over the Lusitani and Gallaeci.  
 131 Failure of an attack on Aristonicus. End of the slave revolt in Sicily and settlement of the province by the 'leges Rupiliae'. C. Papirius Carbo fails to pass his law 'de tribunis reficiendis', but carries his 'lex tabellaria' (the third). Two plebeian censors in office together for the first time.  
 130 Surrender of Aristonicus.  
 129 Dissensions concerning the execution of the agrarian law. The commissioners are deprived of the power of deciding on the limits of the 'ager publicus'. Death of P. Scipio Aemilianus.  
 126 Law of M. Iunius Pennus to expel foreigners from Rome and 'lex Iunia repetundarum'.  
 125 M. Fulvius Flaccus proposes a law for enfranchising the 'socii'; then goes off to defend Massilia against the Salluvii. Revolt and destruction of Fregellae.  
 124 Aquae Sextiae founded in Gaul by the proconsul C. Sextius. War with the Aruerni and Allobroges. Roman citizen colony established at Fabrateria (a consequence of the destruction of Fregellae). C. Gracchus elected tribune.  
 123 The first series of laws brought forward by C. Gracchus, who is reelected to the tribunate.  
 122 The 'lex iudiciaria' and 'lex de prouinciis' of C. Gracchus. The 'lex Acilia repetundarum' (*C.I.L.* 1, 198). Counter agitation by M. Liuius Drusus while Gracchus was absent attempting to found a colony of citizens at Carthage, in accordance with the 'lex Rubria'. Foundation of the Roman citizen colonies 'Minerua' (at Scylacium) and 'Neptunia' (at Tarentum); both projected by C. Gracchus.  
 121 L. Opimius (consul) attacks the re-founding of Carthage. The 'senatus consultum ultimum' passed for the first time, in pursuance of which C. Gracchus and M. Fulvius Flaccus and many of their followers are massacred. Many citizens tried and executed by order of Senate alone. Victories over Allobroges and Aruerni and in Balearic isles. Repeal of lex Rubria.

## 163. FROM THE DEATH OF C. GRACCHUS TO THE SIXTH CONSULSHIP OF MARIUS.

- 120 L. Opimius, accused of treason, is defended by Carbo and acquitted.  
 119 Carbo, prosecuted for treason by L. Crassus the orator (then a young man), commits suicide. C. Marius (tribune) carries a law to check undue influence in the voting at the comitia ('pontes angustos fecit').  
 118 Foundation of Narbo Martius (one of the burgess colonies projected by C. Gracchus). Agrarian law (Appian, *B. C.* 1, 27).  
 116 Trouble raised in Africa by Iugurtha. C. Marius elected praetor. *Birth of M. Terentius Varro, the polymath.*

- 115 M. Aemilius Scaurus, appointed 'princeps senatus', holds the position till 89.
- 114 Great defeat of C. Porcius Cato (consul) in Thrace by the Scordisci, who overrun Thessaly and Macedonia. C. Marius propraetor in Spain (the first propraetor known to have passed his year of praetorship in the capital). *Birth of the orator Hortensius*. Temple of Venus Verticordia.
- 113 Defeat of Cn. Carbo at Noreia by the Cimbri, who turn aside into Gaul.
- 112 The Scordisci driven beyond the Danube. Iugurtha murders Adherbal. War declared against him; but the commander Bestia grants him peace.
- 111 Agitation at Rome concerning Iugurtha. He is summoned to Rome, procures the assassination there of Massius, a grandson of Masinissa, and flees the capital. The war renewed. *Lex agraria* (*C.I.L.* I, 200). 'Lex Servilia repetundarum'.
- 110 A disaster in Africa leads to the 'lex Mamilia', establishing a court to try all who had had corrupt dealings with Iugurtha. Four ex-consuls and many others condemned.
- 109 Q. Caecilius Metellus (consul) carries on the war in Africa in this and the following year with C. Marius as one of his legates. The other consul, M. Iunius Silanus, defeated in Gaul by the Cimbri. The 'uia Aemilia', constructed in Liguria by Scaurus (censor). *Birth of T. Pomponius Atticus*.
- 108 Massacre of Roman garrison at Vaga.
- 107 First consulship of Marius. The command in Numidia conferred on him by the Comitia and held by him for three years. Iugurtha and his ally Bocchus, king of Mauretania, suffer defeat, and Bocchus sues for peace. L. Cassius Longinus, the other consul, is killed with most of his army by the Gaulish tribe of the Tigurini. The 'lex Caelia tabellaria' (the fourth and last) introduced secret voting in trials for treason ('perduellio') at the hands of the assembly. Proletarii admitted to legions by Marius.
- 106 L. Sulla, quaestor under Marius, induces Bocchus to surrender Iugurtha. Law of Q. Servilius Caepio (consul) to restore the 'iudicia' to the Senate. [The law was probably only proposed not passed. If passed, it was soon cancelled.] Servilius takes Tolosa, and appropriates much gold there captured. Birth of Cicero and of Cn. Pompeius.
- 105 The Cimbri destroy two Roman armies near Arausio. Servilius Caepio (proconsul), who had commanded one of them, is stripped of his imperium, and imprisoned, then freed by a tribune, but goes into exile. Birth of the great lawyer Ser. Sulpicius Rufus.
- 104 Second consulship of Marius. 'Lex Domitia de sacerdotibus'.
- 103 Third consulship of Marius. First tribunate of Saturninus. New slave revolt in Sicily which continues till 99. M. Antonius (praetor) despatched to Cilicia against the pirates. Cn. Domitius, author of the 'lex Domitia', appointed pontifex maximus by the people. *Death of the comic dramatist Turpilius*. 103 or 102 *Death of Lucilius*.
- 102 Fourth consulship of Marius, who destroys the Teutoni at Aquae Sextiae. Birth of C. Iulius Caesar. *The poet Archias comes to Rome*.
- 101 Fifth consulship of Marius, who with the proconsul Q. Lutatius Catulus crushes the Cimbri near Vercellae. Temple of 'Fortuna huiusce diei' in Campus Martius and new temple of Honos and Virtus.
- 100 Sixth consulship of Marius. Violent course of L. Apuleius Saturninus (tribune for the second time) and the praetor C. Servilius Glaucia. *Leges Apuleiae de maiestate* and *agraria* and *frumentaria* and *de coloniis*. The oath to observe the agrarian law refused by Metellus; his exile. Marius, armed by the 'senatus consultum ultimum', suppresses Saturninus and his crew, with the loss of their lives. The laws (except 'de maiestate') are quashed by the Senate. Citizen colony founded at Eporodia in Cisalpine Gaul; also two in Corsica. *L. Aelius Stilo Praeconinus gives Latin instruction about this time*.

#### 164. FROM THE SUPPRESSION OF SATURNINUS TO THE END OF THE SOCIAL WAR.

- 99 Lex agraria of S. Titius, also quashed by the Senate. Condemnation of supporters of Saturninus by commission from the Senate. Recall of Metellus. *Birth of Lucretius.*
- 98 'Lex Caecilia Didia' requiring the interval of the 'trinundinum' between the publication of a law and the voting on it and forbidding legislation 'per saturam'.
- 97 Human sacrifice said to have been forbidden at Rome.
- 96 The realm of Cyrene is bequeathed to Rome by the king, but the Senate decrees the freedom of the cities there.
- 95 'Lex Licinia Mucia de ciuibus in suam ciuitatem redigundis' (to expel from Rome the socii who had no right to settle there). Passed by the two consuls, Crassus the orator and Scaeuola the pontifex maximus. This law was a chief cause of the Social war. Birth of Cato 'Uticensis'.
- 92 L. Cornelius Sulla (propraetor) reinstates Ariobarzanes, king of Cappadocia, who had been driven out by Mithridates. Condemnation of P. Rutilius (ex-consul) brings the equestrian 'iudices' into great disrepute.
- 91 M. Liuius Drusus runs a career similar to that of C. Gracchus. His laws are quashed by the Senate. The sudden death of Drusus, and his failure to enfranchise the Italians, bring on the Social war. Law of Q. Varius Hybrida, establishing a special court to try those who had encouraged the allies. Many condemned in the following year. Death of the orator Crassus.
- 90 The Social war proceeds with varying fortune. The 'lex Iulia' confers the franchise on the allies who had not joined in the revolt. *L. Plotius Gallus teaches rhetoric in Latin.*
- 89 'Lex Plautia Papiria' extends the grant of the franchise. During this year and the early part of the following the allies are overcome. The 'lex Plautia iudiciaria' and the lex Pompeia 'de Transpadanis'. Mithridates expels Ariobarzanes from Cappadocia and Nicomedes from Bithynia. *The Greek sculptor Pasiteles comes to Rome about this time.*

#### 165. SULLA AND THE MARIAN PARTY.

- 88 Consulship of Sulla, to whom the war against Mithridates is assigned. P. Sulpicius Rufus, tribune of the plebs, passes a law to distribute the new citizens and the libertini over the 35 tribes and another depriving Sulla and his colleague of their provinces and appointing Marius to the command in Asia Minor. Rufus is killed; Marius and his son are driven to flight. Q. Pompeius, the second consul, is killed by his soldiers. Mithridates overruns Asia and orders a great massacre of Romans.
- 87 Mithridates conquers most of the islands and passes to Athens. Sulla besieges it into the next year when it is captured. Revolutionary proceedings at Rome of L. Cornelius Cinna (consul) who is driven out by his colleague Octavius and stripped of his imperium. Marius comes to his support and captures the city. Massacre of distinguished men. *Birth of Catullus and of Sallust.*
- 86 Seventh consulship of Marius and second of Cinna. Marius died on Jan. 13. L. Valerius Flaccus, elected in his place, is sent to take command against Mithridates while Cinna remains in Rome. Archelaus, general of Mithridates, is defeated at Chaeronea by Sulla. Census, [the 'lustrum' was only afterwards completed in 70 and 23 B.C.]. Lex Valeria 'de aere alieno'.



- 85 Third consulship of Cinna, with Cn. Papirius Carbo. Successes of Sulla. Flaccus killed by his soldiers. His legate, C. Fimbria, continues operations against Mithridates, and captures Pergamum with other towns, but his troops desert him and he kills himself.
- 84 Fourth consulship of Cinna and second of Carbo. Cinna, about to cross to Asia to attack Sulla, is murdered by his soldiers at Ancona. Carbo remains sole consul. Terms of peace granted by Sulla to Mithridates.
- 83 The Marians collect an army to meet Sulla, who lands in Italy early in the year. Sulla is joined by some Marian troops and by the young Cn. Pompeius who had raised three legions in Picenum. Q. Sertorius (propraetor) goes to Spain. Burning of the Capitoline temple. L. Murena attacks Mithridates anew, but with poor success.
- 32 Consulship of the younger Marius, with Carbo (consul for the third time). Sulla defeats the Marians, and Marius is shut up in Praeneste, which is captured after a siege. Marius kills himself. A large army of Samnites comes to the aid of the Marians and is cut to pieces by Sulla at the Colline Gate (1 Nov.). [The 'ludi victoriae Sullanae' commemorated this victory.] Dictatorship of Sulla and proscriptions.
- 81 Triumph of Sulla (27 Jan.). The 'leges Corneliae' passed. Successes of Cn. Pompeius in Africa against the Marians. His first triumph. Close of the Second Mithridatic war. *Cicero's speech 'pro Quinctio'*.
- 80 Surrender of Volaterrae to Sulla. Sertorius continues his operations in Spain against Metellus. *Cicero's speech 'pro Roscio Amerino'*.
- 79 Sulla resigns his authority. War against the pirates in Cilicia.

#### 166. FROM SULLA'S DEATH TO THE FIRST CONSULSHIP OF POMPEIUS.

- 78 Death of Sulla early in the year. Dissension between the two consuls, M. Aemilius Lepidus and Q. Lutatius Catulus, because the former aimed at overthrowing the régime established by Sulla. Sertorius defeats Metellus. Lex Plautia 'de ui'.
- 77 The proconsul Catulus defeats M. Lepidus at the 'pons Muluius', and again in Etruria. The 'senatus consultum ultimum' passed against Lepidus, who flees to Sardinia and dies there. Many of his followers, including M. Perperna, join Sertorius. C. Iulius Caesar prosecutes Dolabella, ex-governor of Macedonia, for extortion.
- 76 Cn. Pompeius defeats and kills M. Brutus, the legate of Lepidus in Cisalpine Gaul, and is despatched to Spain as colleague of Metellus with equal authority, but is not fortunate at first. An agitation begun to remove some of Sulla's restrictions on the tribunate.
- 75 A law of C. Aurelius Cotta (consul) restores to the tribunes the right of standing for other magistracies after the tribunate. Some districts annexed in Cilicia, in consequence of the war with the pirates. Cicero quaestor in Sicily.
- 74 The consuls L. Licinius Lucullus and M. Aurelius Cotta are commissioned to attack Mithridates, the former on land, the latter by sea. [Lucullus remained in Asia till 67.] Cotta is severely defeated by Mithridates, who attacks Cyzicus, but is himself besieged by Lucullus. Great successes of Sertorius. Bithynia, bequeathed to Rome by king Nicomêdes, becomes a province; also Cyrene. A large commission given to M. Antonius against the pirates.
- 73 Severe defeat of Mithridates at Cyzicus; his fleet is destroyed by storm soon after. The war of gladiators and slaves under Spartacus begins. Lex Terentia Cassia frumentaria. Agitation of C. Licinius Macer (tribune).
- 72 Spartacus defeats both the consuls of the year and a proconsul. Sertorius assassinated by the treachery of Perperna, who is defeated and killed by Cn. Pompeius. Lucullus makes his way into Pontus.

- 71 Spartacus destroyed near Regium with most of his followers by M. Crassus (praetor). Cn. Pompeius returning from Spain falls in with and cuts to pieces the rest of the insurgents. Failure of M. Antonius in an attack on Crete, and his death. Lucullus drives Mithridates before him. Triumph of Pompeius (end of Dec.). Thrace conquered. Ariomistus invades Gaul.

167. FROM THE FIRST CONSULSHIP OF POMPEIUS TO CAESAR'S FIRST CONSULSHIP.

- 70 First consulship of Cn. Pompeius, and of M. Licinius Crassus. Full restoration of former powers of tribunate. Lex Aurelia, constituting juries in criminal courts equally from among the senators, equites and tribuni aerarii. Trial of Verres. Mithridates driven to take refuge with his son-in-law, Tigranes, king of Armenia. Census at Rome. *Birth of Virgil*.
- 69 Lucullus defeats Tigranes and captures Tigranocerta. Cicero curule aedile.
- 68 Lucullus, on his way to attack Artaxāta, is checked by the mutiny of his soldiers. He captures Nisibis<sup>1</sup>. Mithridates occupies Lesser Armenia. Caesar quaestor in Spain. Crete annexed.
- 67 Return of Mithridates to Pontus. Severe defeat of C. Triarius, a legate. The soldiers stop the operations of Lucullus. Tigranes overruns Cappadocia. Lex Calpurnia de ambitu. Lex Roscia theatralis. Lex Gabinia giving Pompeius an extraordinary commission against the pirates, who are subdued in three months. Lex Cornelia on 'solutio legibus'. Lex Gabinia on reception of embassies by Senate.
- 66 The lex Manilia (*supported by Cicero, who was then praetor, in the extant speech*) bestows on Pompeius exceptional powers, for the war against Mithridates.
- 65 Mithridates a fugitive. Pontus made a province. The lex Papia, the last of the Roman 'alien acts'. Caesar curule aedile. Cicero defends C. Cornelius on a charge of treason. First Catilinarian conspiracy. *Birth of Horace*.
- 64 Pompeius in Syria, which is made a province. Senatus Consultum dissolves illegal 'collegia'.
- 63 Consulship of Cicero (the first 'nouus homo' since 94). *His speeches against the agrarian law of Rullus, against Catiline, and in defence of Rabirius (perduellionis reus) and Murena*. 'Senatus consultum ultimum' passed (21 Oct.), and execution of the Catilinarians (5 Dec.). Pompeius in Iudaea. Mithridates assassinated. Lex Tullia de ambitu. Law requiring personal 'professio' of candidates for office probably passed in this year. Birth of the future Emperor Augustus. Caesar elected pontifex maximus.
- 62 Defeat and death of Catiline (Jan.). Caesar's praetorship. Clodius profanes the ceremonies of the Bona Dea. Uproar leads to passing of 'senatus consultum ultimum'. *Cicero's speeches 'pro Sulla' and 'pro Archia'*.
- 61 Return and triumph of Cn. Pompeius. Clodius tried by a special court and acquitted. Caesar in Spain.
- 60 The refusal of the Senate to confirm the 'acta' of Pompeius, and to remit a portion of the price payable by the publicani for the right of collecting taxes in Asia, leads to the formation of a political compact between Caesar, Pompeius and Crassus, to exploit the state for their own purposes. Abolition of the 'portoria' of Italy by a lex Caecilia.

<sup>1</sup> The Syriac form is *N'tsibhîn*, and a hexameter line in the Epitaph of Abercius ends with Νῑσῑβῑν (W. M. Ramsay's *Cities . . of Phrygia*, 727, and Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, i 481, 497<sup>2</sup>). On the other hand, Corippus, *Iohannis*, i 60, has 'Nitzibis agri | et Nesebis'.

# 168. FROM CAESAR'S FIRST CONSULSHIP TO HIS WAR WITH THE POMPEIANS.

- 59 Caesar's first consulship, with Bibulus for colleague. Caesar's *lex agraria* (dividing the 'ager Campanus', and establishing Capua as a 'colonia'). Law remitting a portion of their payment to the publicani. Another to confirm the 'acta' of Pompeius. A *lex Vatinia* bestows the province of Gallia Cisalpina on Caesar, with Illyricum, for five years, and the Senate adds Gallia Narbonensis. *Lex Iulia 'repetundarum'*. Latin colony at Nouum Comum. Clodius transferred to the plebs, and elected to the tribunate. *Cicero's speech 'pro Flacco'*. Bibulus proclaims that by 'watching the sky' he has rendered the legislation of this whole year invalid.
- 58 Revolutionary legislation of Clodius concerning restrictions on legislation, the freedom of the 'collegia', the corn-dole, and the 'nota censoria'. A law of his sends M. Cato to Cyprus to annex it, another gives Macedonia as province to one of the consuls, Piso, and Syria to the other, Gabinius, with enormous grants from the treasury. By legislation, Clodius drives Cicero into exile. Caesar defeats the Heluetii and Ariouistus.
- 57 Subjection of the Belgae by Caesar. Ptolemy, king of Egypt, expelled from his kingdom, seeks Roman aid. Return of Cicero (4 Sept.). Pompeius receives the 'cura annonae' with extensive powers for five years. *Catullus on the staff of Memmius, governor of Bithynia*.
- 56 Conference between Pompeius, Caesar, and Crassus at Luca. *Cicero's speeches 'pro Sestio' and 'in Vatinius', 'pro Caelio', 'de prouinciis consularibus', 'pro Balbo'*.
- 55 Second consulship of Pompeius and Crassus after an 'interregnum'. *Lex Trebonia* bestowing the provinces of Spain on Pompeius, and Syria on Crassus, with great grants from the treasury. Caesar's tenure of his provinces extended for a second period of five years. Caesar's crossing of the Rhine and first expedition to Britain. Gabinius, governor of Syria, for a great bribe, restores Ptolemy. *Lex Pompeia iudiciaria*. *Lex Licinia de sodaliciis*. *Cicero's speech 'in Pisonem'*. *Death of Lucretius*. Theatre of Pompeius, with shrines of Venus Victrix, Honos and Virtus, Felicitas. *Completion of Cicero's dialogue 'de Oratore' (Nov.)*.
- 54 Second expedition of Caesar to Britain. Rising of the Neruii and other Gaulish tribes. Crassus plunders the temple at Jerusalem. Pompeius remains near Rome, sending *legati* to govern his provinces for him. *Cicero defends Gabinius and Scaurus (both 'repetundarum') and Plancius ('ambitus'), and begins the 'De re publica'*. Death of Iulia, Caesar's daughter, wife of Pompeius. *Death of Catullus*.
- 53 An 'interregnum' of more than six months. Caesar's second crossing of the Rhine. Crushing defeat of the Roman army by the Parthians at Carrhae (9 June), and death of Crassus.
- 52 The year opens with an 'interregnum'. On Jan. 18 Milo kills Clodius on the Appian way ('pugna Bouillana'). Disorders caused by the funeral of Clodius. Near the end of Febr. Pompeius is elected consul for the third time, and is for some months without a colleague. Special laws passed concerning violence and bribery, under which Milo and many others are condemned. Law prolonging Pompeius' tenure of his provinces for another five years. *Lex Pompeia* giving Caesar the right to stand for the consulship without appearing in Rome. Then Pompeius, in a general law about magistracies, omits to mention Caesar's privilege. The great movement of Vercingetorix in Gaul. Capture of Alesia. *Cicero's speech 'pro Milone'; he begins his dialogue 'de Legibus'*.

- 51 Attempts to deprive Caesar of his command. Cicero governor of Cilicia. Completion of the conquest of Gaul. *Poseidōnios comes to Rome.*
- 50 Struggle between the factions of Caesar and Pompeius. Curio as tribune defends Caesar, who parts with two legions (one previously lent to him by Pompeius) to be sent as reinforcements to the East. These legions retained by Pompeius. *Death of Hortensius the orator.* Destruction of a temple of Isis within the walls by order of the Senate.

### 169. FROM THE CROSSING OF THE RUBICON TO THE TRIUMVIRATE.

- 49 7 Jan. A resolution proposed to the Senate for depriving Caesar of his command is vetoed by two tribunes, Q. Cassius and M. Antonius. These, threatened with violence, take refuge with Caesar. The 'Senatus consultum ultimum' is passed, authorising Pompeius and others to deal with Caesar, who crosses the Rubicon, and pursues Pompeius to Brundisium, but fails to bar his departure for Greece (17 Mar.). Caesar crushes Pompeius' partisans at Ilerda in Spain (2 Aug.) and then captures Massilia. Returning to Rome he holds his first dictatorship for eleven days only, during which he is elected consul. Caesar's officers Curio in Africa and Dolabella in the Adriatic defeated. The 'ciuitas' bestowed on the Transpadanes. *Lex Rubria.*
- 48 Caesar crosses into Greece. Pompeius besets Caesar at Dyrrhachium. Caesar breaks through and wins the great battle of Pharsalia in Thessaly (9 Aug.). Flight of Pompeius to Egypt, where he is killed. Caesar enters on his second dictatorship at Alexandria. The 'tribunicia potestas' bestowed on him. Agitation set on foot by Caelius and Milo in Italy.
- 47 The 'bellum Alexandrinum' ends on 27 Mar. and on 2 Aug. Caesar defeats Pharnaces, son of Mithridates, at Zela ('ueni, uidi, uici'). Caesar at Rome in Sept.
- 46 Caesar at Lilybaeum in Jan., then crosses to Africa, and crushes the Pompeians at Thapsus. Death of M. Cato at Utica. Great fourfold triumph of Caesar. This year has fifteen months, owing to Caesar's reform of the Calendar. He travels to Spain. *Cicero's speeches 'pro Marcello' and 'pro Ligario'; his 'Brutus' and the 'Orator' and the 'Paradoxa'.* Temple of Venus Genetrix consecrated in Caesar's forum. Reduction of recipients of corn. Restoration of Italian 'portoria'. Series of 'leges Iuliae', including 'lex Iulia municipalis'.
- 45 Final defeat of the Pompeians at Munda (17 Mar.). Caesar returns to Rome in Oct. *Death of Cicero's daughter Tullia. The 'Hortensius', 'Academica', and 'De Finibus' produced.*
- 44 Caesar assassinated (15 Mar.). Amnesty declared, on Cicero's motion in the Senate (17 Mar.). Validation of Caesar's 'acta'. Antonius passes a law abolishing the office of dictator for ever. Recognition of Caesar's heir C. Octavius, by the Senate. Antonius besieges Decimus Brutus at Mutina. *Cicero's earlier Philippic orations (i—iv). Production of the 'Tusculan Disputations', the 'De Natura Deorum', the 'Cato Maior', the 'Laelius', the 'De Officiis', the 'De Diuinatione', the 'De Fato', and the 'De Gloria'.*
- 43 *Cicero's later Philippic orations.* Laws and 'acta' of Antonius annulled. Octavian, receiving praetorian imperium, is given a command against Antonius, along with the two consuls, Hirtius and Pansa. Death of the two consuls at Mutina (Apr.). Antonius driven into Gallia Transalpina. Brutus meanwhile occupies Macedonia, and Cassius Syria. Octavian demands further recognition at the sword's point, and on 19 Aug. is made consul with Q. Pedius. 'Lex Pedia' establishing a court to try Caesar's murderers.



Antonius crosses the Alps with a large force. Decimus Brutus killed by his own soldiers. Agreement between Antonius, Lepidus and Octavian to form the 'Triumvirate', with absolute power, nominally conferred by law, for five years. Proscriptions follow. *Birth of Ovid*. Death of the great lawyer Ser. Sulpicius Rufus.

# 170. FROM THE BATTLE OF PHILIPPI TO THE DEATH OF ANTONIUS.

- 42 The two battles at Philippi and the deaths of Brutus and Cassius (Sept. Oct.). Antonius goes to the East, Octavian to Italy. Gallia Cisalpina incorporated with Italy. Birth of the future emperor Tiberius.
- 41 'Bellum Perusinum'. Sextus Pompeius and Dolabella range the sea with fleets. Antonius goes to Alexandria with Cleopatra.
- 40 C. Asinius Pollio consul. L. Cornelius Balbus 'consul suffectus' (not having passed through the lower offices); the first man of non-Roman birth to obtain the consulate. Surrender of Perusia (Mar.). Trouble with Sextus Pompeius. Expedition of Antonius to Brundisium. 'Treaty of Brundisium' concluded, dividing the Roman world between Octavian and Antonius, with little regard to Lepidus and some concessions to Sextus Pompeius. Antonius marries Octavian's sister Octavia. Herod, a fugitive at Rome, declared king of Iudaea by the Senate. The last 'lex tribunicia' passed in this year.
- 39 Fresh trouble with Sex. Pompeius. 'Treaty of Misenum' between Octavian, Antonius, and Pompeius. Agreement to continue the Triumviral authority. Successes of Octavian's officer Agrippa in Gaul and on the Rhine.
- 38 The conditions of the 'Treaty of Misenum' not having been carried out, Sext. Pompeius makes war. Two fleets of Octavian destroyed. He marries Livia. The legate of Antonius, Ventidius Bassus, defeats the Parthians. Sixty-seven praetors in this year, holding office for brief periods.
- 37 Differences between Octavian and Antonius adjusted by the 'Treaty of Tarentum'. Probable *formal* extension of the Triumviral imperium for another five years (denied by Mommsen). Octavian sends two legions to Antonius, while Antonius sends a fleet to Octavian, to be used against Pompeius. 'Portus Iulius' constructed by Agrippa. C. Sosius, legate of Antonius, captures Jerusalem after a siege and establishes Herod as king.
- 36 Failure of a fresh expedition against Pompeius. Then Agrippa, aided by Lepidus, who crossed into Sicily from Africa, crushes Pompeius. Octavian strips Lepidus of his power and annexes his province of Africa. Failure of Antonius' expedition against Parthia. 'Potestas tribunicia' of Octavian.
- 35 Last effort of Sext. Pompeius in Asia, where he is killed. Military mutiny in Italy.
- 34 Conquest of the Dalmatians and the Salassi by Octavian's commanders. *Death of the historian Sallust*.
- 33 New Dalmatian war. Refusal of Antonius to meet Octavia, who desired to arrange differences between him and her brother.
- 32 Divorce of Octavia by Antonius, who is attacked in the Senate by Octavian. Antonius deprived of his imperium and war proclaimed, nominally against Cleopatra. Octavian now probably rested his authority on his special war-commission. *Death of T. Pomponius Atticus*.
- 31 Battle of Actium (2 Sept.). Octavian winters in Asia.

# 171. FROM THE BATTLE OF ACTIUM TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EMPIRE.

- 30 Fourth consulship of Octavian. He is called to Italy in the spring by the insubordination of the soldiers, and the general unrest. He divides lands among his veterans; then goes by way of Greece to Egypt, arriving in the summer. Death of Antonius (1 Aug.) and Cleopatra. Annexation of Egypt and occupation of all the dominions of Antonius. Recognition of Herod, with increased territory. *Horace's Second Book of Satires*. Octavian winters at Samos.
- 29 Fifth consulship of Octavian. Triple triumph for victories in Dalmatia, at Actium and in Egypt (13, 14, 15 Aug.). Great largess to soldiers and people. Dedication of important public buildings, especially the 'templum diui Iuli'. Lex Saenia, allowing Octavian to add to the number of patrician families. A Roman force crosses the Balkans for the first time. Colonisation of Carthage completed. Temples permitted of Roma with 'dius Iulius' at Ephesus and of Roma with Octavian at Pergamum and Nicomedia (but only for provincials). *Horace's Epodes published. Virgil's Georgics completed*.
- 28 Sixth consulship of Octavian. With his colleague Agrippa he carries out a census of Roman citizens and removes about 200 members from the Senate. Dedication of temple of Apollo on the Palatine and celebration of 'ludi' in honour of Actium. Control of aerarium given to ex-praetors chosen annually by the Senate ('praefecti aerarii Saturni'). Octavian annuls exceptional measures taken since the creation of the Triumvirate.
- 27 Seventh consulship of Octavian. He resigns his extraordinary powers (Jan.) and 'transfers the commonwealth to the Roman people' (Monumentum Ancyranum). The provinces are divided between him and the Senate, and a law confirms him in his control for ten years, with the power to make war and peace. Many further honours decreed to him, including the name 'Augustus'. The laurel chaplet and 'corona ciuica' (henceforth imperial emblems) placed on the door of his palace. He visits Gaul (late in the year) and organises the provinces of Aquitania, Gallia Lugdunensis and Belgica. Elections by comitia restored, the emperor receiving the right of 'commendatio' whereby he fills a certain proportion of the places. *Poem of Tibullus in honour of Messalla's triumph*.

# 172. FIRST DECENNIUM OF THE REIGN OF AUGUSTUS.

- 26 Eighth consulship of Augustus (entered on in Spain). Suicide of Cn. Cornelius Gallus, charged with treason. Tiridates, exiled king of Parthia, visits Augustus in Spain, bringing with him the young son of his successful rival Phraates. *Death of the polymath M. Terentius Varro (or 27)*.
- 25 Ninth consulship of Augustus. New office of 'Praefectus Vrbi' conferred on Messalla; his resignation after a few days; the office long remains in abeyance. Successful attacks on the Cantabri and Astures in Spain, the Salassi (sub-Alpine tribe) and on some German tribes. Expedition of Aelius Gallus to Arabia. Augusta Emerita (Merida) founded; also Augusta Praetoria (Aosta). Marriage of Iulia and the young Marcellus. Agrippa completes the Pantheon. Numidia joined with Africa. Iuba king of Mauretania.
- 24 Tenth consulship of Augustus, who reaches Rome near the end of the year. He surrenders the young Parthian prince to Phraates. *The first three books of Horace's Odes*.
- 23 Eleventh consulship of Augustus, which he resigns during a critical illness. The 'potestas tribunicia' conferred on him for life in a new form; also (ac-

- cording to some authorities) the 'proconsulare imperium'. Great commission in the East given to Agrippa; but he retires to Mitylene, for two years. Death of Marcellus (late summer). The 'praefecti aerarii' replaced by two of the praetors.
- 22 Famine and pestilence cause the people to clamour for Augustus to accept a dictatorship and censorship for life. He declines an offer of a life consulship, but accepts a special 'cura annonae'. Censors appointed, the last, excepting Claudius, and the Flavian emperors, who held the office. 'Ludi publici' transferred to praetors, with a subvention from the treasury. Conspiracy of Caepio and Murena. Fresh revolts in Spain. Cyprus and the Provincia Narbonensis transferred to the Senate. Augustus leaves for the East.
- 21 Augustus, elected consul, declines; electoral riots ensue. Agrippa is compelled to divorce the emperor's niece, and to marry Julia. He is placed in charge of affairs at Rome. Augustus in Greece and at Samos.
- 20 Visit of Augustus to Asia Minor, where he makes many changes in the status of cities, peoples and princes. Tiberius commands an expedition to Armenia. Phraates surrenders the Roman standards. Birth of Gaius, son of Agrippa and Julia. *The first book of Horace's Epistles.*
- 19 Augustus reaches Rome (12 Oct.). 'Ludi Augustales' instituted to celebrate annually the day of his return. Dedication of a temple of Roma with Augustus at Pergamum. The Cantabri exterminated by Agrippa. *Death of Virgil at Brundisium, on his way back from Greece, in company of Augustus (21 Sept.). Death of Tibullus.*
- 18 'Imperium proconsulare', given in 27, renewed for five years (so Dio; but more probably ten). The 'potestas tribunicia' given to Agrippa for five years. Lex Iulia de adulteriis passed, but a 'lex de maritandis ordinibus' rejected by the comitia. Senate reduced to 600 members. Herod visits Rome.

### 173. SECOND DECENNIUM OF AUGUSTUS.

- 17 Birth of Lucius, son of Agrippa and Julia, who leave Rome for the East. The emperor adopts, as his sons, his two grandsons. The 'ludi saeculares', with *Horace's 'carmen saeculare'*.
- 16 Defeat of Lollius in Germany. Augustus goes with Tiberius to Gaul. Noricum made a province, under a 'procurator'. Risings in Illyricum, Istria and Thrace. T. Statilius Taurus named 'Praefectus Urbi' during the absence of Augustus from Rome. *Death of Propertius.*
- 15 Victory of Tiberius and Drusus over the Raeti and Vindēlici (1 Aug.). Annexation of their country as a procuratorial province. Pacification and organisation of sub-Alpine districts. Augustus reserves to himself the right to coin gold and silver for the empire, leaving to the Senate the copper coinage (now resumed, after a long period of abeyance). Birth of Germanicus (son of Drusus) and of Drusus (son of Tiberius).
- 14 Many colonies founded about this time, especially in Spain and Gaul. Agrippa confirms Jewish privileges in the cities of Asia. Privileges conferred on the Jews by Agrippa.
- 13 First consulship of Tiberius (passed in Rome). Return of Augustus to the capital (4 July). Drusus in sole command in Gaul and on the Rhine. Return of Agrippa and renewal of his 'tribunicia potestas' for five years; he leaves to suppress a great revolt in Pannonia. Death of Lepidus, formerly Triumvir (vacating the office of 'Pontifex Maximus'). *Probable date of the fourth book of Horace's Odes and his Epistle to Augustus.*
- 12 Election of Augustus as Pontifex Maximus (6 Mar.). After this the office is restricted to the emperors. Death of Agrippa. Tiberius succeeds him in

Pannonia, while Drusus repels the Sicambri and other tribes on the Rhine. Important operations of a Roman flotilla on the Rhine and the sea-coast between Rhine and Weser. *The Epistle of Horace to Florus.*

- 11 Dedication of the theatre of Marcellus (4 May). Death of the emperor's sister Octavia. Tiberius compelled to divorce the daughter of Agrippa, and to marry Iulia. Victories of Drusus on the Rhine. Campaign of Tiberius in Pannonia. Trouble in Thrace and Macedonia. Illyricum transferred from Senate to Emperor.
- 10 Augustus inaugurates (1 Aug.) the 'ara Romae et Augusti' at Lugudunum. Claudius born there on the same day. Continuance of the war in Germany and Pannonia. Herod completes Caesarea, so named in honour of Augustus.
- 9 Dedication of the 'ara pacis Augustae' (30 Jan.). Drusus penetrates to the Elbe, but during his retreat dies from the effect of a fall from his horse (14 Sept.). Tiberius brings the body to Rome. The name 'Germanicus' bestowed on Drusus and his descendants. Triumph of Tiberius over Dalmatians and Pannonians. *Horace's Epistle to the Pisones. Livy's History ended with this year.*
- 8 'Imperium proconsulare' renewed for ten years. The 'mensis Sextilis' becomes 'mensis Augustus'. Victories of Tiberius over the Sicambri and other Germans. Census of Roman citizens. Fresh municipal organisation of Rome; creation of 14 'regiones' and 265 'uici'. The arch at Susa erected by Cottius in honour of the emperor. Death of Maecenas. *Death of Horace.*

#### 174. THIRD DECENNIUM OF AUGUSTUS.

- 7 Triumph of Tiberius for German victories. Fresh campaign in Germany.
- 6 Bestowal of the 'tribunicia potestas' on Tiberius for five years. He is sent on an important mission to the East, but retires for some years to Rhodes. The 'tropaeum Augusti' at Turbia erected to commemorate the subjugation of 46 sub-Alpine tribes.
- 5 The prince Gaius assumes the 'toga uiril' and among other honours is named 'princeps iuuentutis' by the Equites.
- 4 Death of Herod. His will, dividing his dominions among three sons, confirmed by Augustus. Census of the Jews carried out by the legate of Syria, P. Sulpicius Quirinius. Disturbances in Judaea. *Birth of L. Annaeus Seneca at Corduba.*
- 2 Augustus receives the title 'pater patriae'. Recipients of corn at Rome reduced from 320,000 to 200,000. The prince Lucius assumes the 'toga uiril' and receives honours (including the title 'princeps iuuentutis'). Banishment of Iulia (with her daughter Iulia) and punishment of her accomplices.
- 1 Gaius goes, on a mission of importance, to the East.
- A.D. 1 Gaius consul (though in Syria).
- 2 Gaius meets the Parthian king on the Euphrates. Death of his brother Lucius at Massilia (20 Aug.). Rising of Cherusci and Chauci. Return of Tiberius to Rome.
- 3 'Imperium proconsulare' renewed for ten years. Gaius wounded in Armenia.

#### 175. FOURTH DECENNIUM OF AUGUSTUS.

- 4 Gaius dies of his wound in Lycia (21 Feb.). Augustus causes Tiberius to adopt as his son Germanicus, son of Drusus; then Augustus adopts both as his own sons. Grant of 'imperium proconsulare' and 'tribunicia potestas' to Tiberius for ten years (so Dio; five years, Suet.); he defeats the Cherusci. The lex Aelia Sentia. Temple at Nemausus in honour of Gaius and Lucius ('Maison Carrée' at Nîmes).



- 5 Roman army marches to the Elbe, and is met there by the flotilla. Famine at Rome.
- 6 Creation of the 'aerarium militare'. Imposition of the 'uicesima hereditatum' and the 'centesima rerum uenialium'. Sore famine leads to the creation of a new equestrian office, the 'praefectura annonae'. The corps of 'uigiles' established, under an equestrian 'praefectus'. The provinces of Sardinia (with Corsica) and Moesia transferred to the emperor. Judaea (with Samaria) becomes a procuratorial province, on the expulsion of Archelaus. Tiberius, about to attack Maroboduus, is further menaced by a great insurrection in Dalmatia and Illyricum, but is saved from destruction by a compact with Maroboduus.
- 7 Victory of Germanicus in Dalmatia and of the army of Tiberius in Pannonia. The arch of Pavia erected. Exile of Agrippa Postumus, the last surviving grandson of Augustus.
- 8 The force of the rebellion is broken.
- 9 Triumph of Tiberius, and his return to Pannonia. Great defeat of Varus by Arminius at the 'saltus Teutoburgensis'. Tiberius with Germanicus, on the Rhine. The lex Papia Poppaea. 9 (or 8) *The 'relegatio' of Ovid.*
- 10 Rhine defences organised; four legions in upper Germany, with headquarters at Moguntiacum (Mainz); four in lower, with headquarters at Castra Vetera (Xanten). Vonones, a hostage at Rome, sent by Augustus to occupy the Parthian throne.
- 12 First consulship of Germanicus. Tiberius in sole command on the Rhine. Birth of Gaius (Caligula, son of Germanicus and Agrippina).
- 13 Triumph of Tiberius for victories in Pannonia. Renewal of his 'proconsulare imperium' and 'tribunicia potestas' without limit of time. Germanicus left on the Rhine. Imperial powers of Augustus renewed for ten years. Piso is 'Praefectus Vrbi' (till 32) in the absence of the emperor.

#### 176. LAST MONTHS OF AUGUSTUS. FIRST NINE YEARS OF TIBERIUS' REIGN.

- 14 Census of Roman citizens (nearly 5,000,000 enumerated). Death of Augustus at Nola (19 Aug.) and succession of Tiberius. Execution of Agrippa Postumus. The ashes of Augustus deposited in his 'Mausoleum'. His deification (17 Sept.). Powers of the comitia transferred to the Senate. Great military mutinies in Pannonia and Germany. Death of Iulia, daughter of Augustus. *The 'Astronomica' of Manilius written after the deification of Augustus. Final composition of the 'Monumentum Ancyranum'.*
- 15 Perilous campaign against Arminius.
- 16 Germanicus advances to the Elbe, and returns by the river and the sea to the Rhine. He is recalled, and the attempt to extend the Roman frontier to the Elbe is abandoned. Birth of the younger Agrippina.
- 17 Triumph of Germanicus (26 May), who goes to the East. Rising of Tacfarinas in Africa (not subdued for many years). Annexation of Cappadocia and Commagene. *Death of Ovid at Tömi, and of Livy at Patavium.*
- 18 Feud between Germanicus and Piso, legate of Syria.
- 19 Germanicus in Egypt. His death in Syria (10 Oct.). Piso compelled by the troops to leave Syria. Maroboduus in exile at Ravenna. Lex Iunia Norbana.
- 20 Agrippina brings the ashes of Germanicus to Rome. Piso, charged with treason and procuring the death of Germanicus, commits suicide.
- 21 Tiberius retires for a time to Campania. Rising of Iulius Florus and Iulius Sacrovir in Gaul. The arch at Arausio (Orange) erected to commemorate their defeat. Assassination of Arminius.
- 22 'Tribunicia potestas' conferred on Drusus, son of Tiberius.

- 23 Seianus, Prefect of the Praetorians, concentrates them in a camp just outside the city walls. Death of Drusus, son of Tiberius (attributed by Tacitus to Seianus). Temple in honour of Tiberius, Liuia and the Senate, at Smyrna.

#### 177. END OF TIBERIUS' REIGN.

- 26 Feud of Seianus with Agrippina. Final departure of Tiberius from Rome, after which time the new office of 'Praefectus Vrbi' becomes permanent (even in the emperor's presence). Pontius Pilate procurator of Judaea.
- 27 Tiberius settles at Caprae.
- 28 Appearance of Tiberius and Seianus in Campania. Servility of the Senate. Death of Iulia, grand-daughter of Augustus, in exile. Marriage of the younger Agrippina with Cn. Domitius.
- 29 Agrippina the elder and her son Nero exiled. Drusus, another son of Germanicus, imprisoned.
- 30 *The history of Velleius Paterculus published.*
- 31 Seianus receives the 'imperium proconsulare', but is soon after destroyed, with his family and many adherents. Macro succeeds to the command of the Praetorians.
- 33 Great financial crisis (Tac. *Ann.* vi 16, 17). Execution of Drusus, son of Germanicus. Death of the elder Agrippina.
- 36 Pontius Pilate, accused of maladministration, sent to Rome by L. Vitellius, legate of Syria. Herod Agrippa imprisoned.
- 37 Death of Tiberius at Misenum (16 Mar.). *Phaedrus flourishes under Tiberius and Gaius.*

#### 178. THE REIGN OF GAIUS.

- 37 Gaius (Caligula) emperor (18 Mar.). Tiberius (grandson of the emperor Tiberius) forced to commit suicide. Gaius is consul for a few days; Claudius also consul (his first office). Birth of Nero (the future emperor).
- 38 Gaius 'restores the comitia'. He puts to death and then deifies his sister Drusilla. Riots at Alexandria between Jews and Gentiles, who had tried to place statues of Gaius in the synagogues. Deposition of Auillius Flaccus, Prefect of Egypt. Macro's enforced suicide.
- 39 Numerous executions. Conspiracy of Lepidus and Gaetulicus, on account of which the emperor's sisters suffer 'relegatio'. Herod Antipas exiled. *Birth of Lucan.*
- 40 Gaius visits Gaul. Hearing that an altar erected to him on the borders of Judaea had been destroyed by Jews, he orders the legate of Syria to place an imperial effigy in the temple at Jerusalem. Herod Agrippa takes over the dominions of Antipas. Auillius Flaccus executed. After making a feint on Britain, Gaius returns to Rome (31 Aug.). Deputation of Jews and Greeks from Alexandria, described by Philo (a member of it) in the 'Legatio ad Gaium'. Herod Agrippa induces Gaius to cancel his order about the temple at Jerusalem. Murder of Ptolemy, king of Mauretania.

#### 179. THE REIGN OF CLAUDIUS.

- 41 Gaius killed (24 Jan.) partly on account of immense taxation and confiscation. Claudius made emperor next day. The first example of a 'donative' to soldiers on accession. The murder of Gaius is avenged and his sisters are recalled. Herod Agrippa's dominions, increased by cession of Judaea, are now nearly as extensive as those of Herod the Great. Judaea ceases to be a procuratorial province. Iulia Liuilla, sister of Gaius, banished at the instance of Messalina. This entails the exile of Seneca, *who wrote his 'Consolatio ad Marciam' about this time, and his 'Consolatio ad Heluiam' during exile.*

- Curtius Rufus flourishes under Claudius.* Commagēnē restored to a native prince.
- 42 The Romans for the first time cross the Atlas range. Two provinces of Mauretania organised ('Caesariana' and 'Tingitana'), under procurators.
- 43 Expedition to Britain; Claudius there for 16 days. Defeat of Caractacus and capture of Camalodunum. The emperor's young son receives the title 'Britannicus'. A. Plautius governor of the new province. *Seneca's 'Consolatio ad Polybium'*.
- 44 Achaia and Macedonia transferred to Senate. Quaestors replace 'praetores aerarii'. Death of Herod Agrippa. Judaea once more a province.
- 46 Edict of Claudius about the Anauni (*C. I. L. v 5050*). Ti. Alexander, nephew of Philo, procurator of Judaea. *Birth of Plutarch.*
- 47 'Ludi Saeculares' (21 Ap.). Corbulo in Germany. Victories of Vespasian and Titus in Britain. Triumph of A. Plautius (the last full triumph accorded to a subject). Claudius (by 'plebiscitum') adds three new letters to the alphabet.
- 48 Claudius grants the Aedui the right to become senators. As censor he registers about 7,000,000 citizens. Death of Messalina and her paramour. Intrigues about a new imperial marriage.
- 49 Claudius marries his brother's daughter Agrippina (the candidate of Pallas) after an enactment had been passed permitting such marriages. Seneca recalled to become tutor to Agrippina's son Domitius. Octavia, daughter of Claudius, betrothed to Domitius.
- 50 Claudius adopts Domitius (henceforward L. Claudius Nero). Foundation of Colonia Agrippinensis (Cologne) and of Roman colony at Camalodunum, with an altar to Roma (or Victoria) and Claudius.
- 51 Burrus becomes Prefect of the Praetorians. Birth of Domitian (23 Oct.). Continued commotions in the East.
- 52 Felix (brother of Pallas) procurator in Judaea.
- 53 Marriage of Nero and Octavia.
- 54 Claudius poisoned (12 Oct.). Nero emperor (13 Oct.). Claudius deified. War with Parthia; Corbulo one of the commanders. *Birth of Tacitus (probably).* *Seneca's 'Ludus de morte Claudii' (the 'Apocolocyntosis').*

#### 180. REIGN OF NERO.

- 55 Nero consul. Pallas ceases to be minister of finance, and is succeeded by Claudius Etruscus. Dissension between Nero and his mother. Britannicus poisoned. *Seneca's 'De Clementia' (dedicated to Nero).*
- 56 Seneca consul. The 'quaestores aerarii' replaced by 'praefecti aerarii', nominated by the emperor.
- 58 Active operations against Parthia. The emperor proposes to abolish all 'uectigalia', but is dissuaded.
- 59 Murder of Agrippina. Success of Corbulo in Armenia. Suetonius Paullinus legate in Britain.
- 60 Festus succeeds Felix in Judaea.
- 61 Vespasian consul. Capture of Mona by Paullinus. Great rising of Iceni (under Boadicea) and Trinobantes. Camalodunum burnt; Londinium and Verulamium captured by insurgents. Great slaughter of Romans and their allies. Victory of Paullinus, and suicide of Boadicea.
- 62 War with Parthia continued. Death of Burrus. Tigellinus becomes Prefect of the Praetorians, with a colleague. Divorce and murder of Octavia. Nero marries Poppaea. *Death of Persius.*
- 63 Arrangement with Parthia. 'Latinitas' bestowed on the people of the Maritime Alps.

- 64 Burning of Rome (19–28 July) and execution of Christians.
- 65 Great conspiracy of Piso, for which many suffer death (*including Lucan and Seneca*) and many exile (*among them Musonius Rufus*). Death of Poppaea.
- 66 Many executions. Paetus Thrasea killed; also *Petronius (author of the 'Satirae')*. Helvidius Priscus exiled. Wide-spread insurrection in Judaea, where Vespasian becomes military commander. The temple of Janus closed for the fifth time. Nero in Greece.
- 67 Victories of Vespasian and Titus over the Jews. Execution of Corbulo.

### 181. FALL OF NERO TO LAST YEAR OF VESPASIAN.

- 68 Further victories of Vespasian. Rebellion of Vindex, governor of Gallia Lugdunensis, who is crushed at Vesontio by Verginius Rufus, legate of upper Germany (March). Galba, governor of the 'prouincia Tarraconensis', becomes a pretender to the throne. Nero, after being declared 'publicus hostis', is killed by a servant at his own request. Galba, accompanied by Otho, reaches Rome (Oct.). His unpopularity.
- 69 Vitellius, commander in lower Germany, is saluted as emperor by his troops, and the legions of upper Germany follow suit (Jan.). Adoption of Piso by Galba (10 Jan.). Galba and Piso killed by Praetorians, who make Otho emperor (15 Jan.). After some failures the legions of Vitellius defeat the forces of Otho at Bedriacum (14 Ap.). Suicide of Otho. Vitellius recognised as emperor (middle of July). Vespasian proclaimed emperor at Alexandria by Ti. Alexander, the Prefect (1 July). He is accepted by the soldiers in the East and on the Danube. His troops sack Cremona (end of Oct.), and capture Rome (21 Dec.), whereupon Vespasian is accepted as emperor. Death of Vitellius (24 Dec.). Rebellion of Batavian cohorts in Germany under Ciuilis.
- 70 Vespasian reaches Rome in Oct. The 'lex regia Vespasiani'. Titus takes Jerusalem (Sept.). Iulius Classicus and Iulius Tutor proclaim the 'imperium Galliarum' (early in the year) and are joined by the troops and the Batavians with Ciuilis. Order restored by Cerealis, the legate of lower Germany. *Institution of professorships by Vespasian; one filled by Quintilian.*
- 71 First consulship of Domitian. Triumph of Vespasian and Titus over Judaea (June). Titus becomes Prefect of the Praetorians and receives the 'tribunicia potestas'. Temple of Janus closed for the sixth time.
- 72 Vespasian and Titus elected censors. Exile and enforced suicide of Helvidius Priscus (about this time).
- 73 Sardinia with Corsica transferred to the emperor.
- 74 'Latinitas' conferred on all districts in Spain not already possessed of the full 'ciuitas'. The last registration of Roman citizens completed.
- 75 Expulsion of philosophers. Temple of Pax completed, with a forum round it richly adorned with statues.
- 76 Birth of Hadrian (24 Jan.). Parthian invasion of Syria.
- 78 Titus again elected censor. Agricola in Britain. Marriage of Tacitus with his daughter.

### 182. TITUS AND DOMITIAN.

- 79 Death of Vespasian and accession of Titus (23 June). Destruction of Pompeii and Herculaneum (Aug.). *Death of Pliny the elder.*
- 80 Great fire at Rome. The 'Coliseum' (Amphitheatrum Flavianum) and the 'Thermae' of Titus opened.
- 81 Erection of the arch of Titus. Death of Titus and accession of Domitian (13 Sept.). Agricola reaches the Clyde and Forth. *The 'Dialogus' of Tacitus composed about this time.*



- 83 'Lex Salpensana' and 'Lex Malacitana'. Domitian's campaign in Germany. Agricola in the extreme N.E. of Britain.
- 84 Victory of Agricola over Galgacus. He sends his fleet round Britain.
- 85 Domitian censor for life. Recall of Agricola.
- 86 The emperor in Moesia to repel the Dacians (under Decebalus). Birth of Antoninus Pius (19 Sept.). Revolt of Saturninus. Many executions. The 'agon Capitolinus' instituted.
- 88 Tacitus praetor. 'Ludi saeculares' celebrated.
- 89 War with Marcomanni. Peace with Dacians, who receive a subsidy from Rome. Triumph of Domitian (Nov.). *Plutarch in Rome about this time.*
- 90 Edict against philosophers. *Retirement of Quintilian.* c. 90 *Death of Valerius Flaccus, who had dedicated his 'Argonautica' to Vespasian.*
- 92 Domitian's campaign against the Sarmatae and Sueui.
- 93 Herennius Senecio, Arulenus Rusticus and the younger Helvidius Priscus condemned to death. Second edict against philosophers. Death of the finance minister Claudius Etruscus (servant of ten emperors), and of Agricola.
- 95 Execution of Clemens, cousin of Domitian, and Glabrio an ex-consul, possibly for Christianity. c. 96 *Death of Statius.*

### 183. NERVA AND TRAJAN.

- 96 Murder of Domitian (18 Sept.) and election of Nerva by the Senate (19 Sept.). The 'lex agraria' of Nerva (the last law voted by the comitia).
- 97 Adoption of Trajan by Nerva. Institution of the 'alimenta'.
- 98 Nerva's death (25 Jan.). Trajan (absent on the Rhine) succeeds, and passes the winter on the Danube. Tacitus consul; *he publishes the 'Agricola' and writes the 'Germania'.*
- 100 The younger Pliny consul. *He delivers his 'Panegyricus'.* Marriage of Hadrian with Trajan's niece, Julia Sabina. Death of Herod Agrippa II (last of the Herods). Extension of 'alimenta'.
- 101 Trajan's first victory over Decebalus. *Death of Silius and (about this time) of Martial.*
- 102 Capture of Sarmizegethusa, and peace with the Dacians. 'Alimenta' established at Velleia.
- 104 New war against Decebalus, ending in 106 with his death and the annexation of Dacia.
- c. 105 *Tacitus' 'Histories'.*
- 107 Triumph of Trajan.
- 111 Pliny, as governor of Bithynia, corresponds with Trajan about the Christians. Marriage of Antoninus Pius and Faustina.
- 113 Trajan begins his campaigns against Parthia. Completion of the Forum and Column of Trajan and the 'Basilica Ulpia'. *Death of Pliny the younger.*
- 115 Conquest of Mesopotamia. The arch at Beneuentum erected in Trajan's honour. Jewish agitations begin.
- 116 Capture of Babylon and Ctesiphon. Jewish risings in several places. *The 'Annals' of Tacitus published.* c. 116 *First Book of Juvenal, whose latest Satires are later than 127.*

### 184. HADRIAN'S REIGN.

- 117 Death of Trajan amid trouble in the East (8 or 9 Aug.). Hadrian, who had been adopted by Trajan, succeeds and abandons Trajan's Eastern conquests. He founds the colony of 'Aelia Capitolina' at Jerusalem.
- 118 Conspiracy of old officers of Trajan. Hadrian reaches Rome (7 or 8 Aug.).
- c. 119 *Death of Tacitus.* c. 119—121 *Suetonius' 'Lives of the Caesars'.*
- 121 Hadrian travels over many of the Western provinces. Birth of M. Aurelius (26 Ap.).

- 122 Hadrian in Britain. Construction of the wall and vallum between Solway and Tyne.
- 124 Hadrian in Asia Minor. Rescript regulating trials of Christians.
- c. 125 Creation of four new officers named 'Iuridici', to administer law in Italy.
- 126 Birth of Pertinax (1 Aug.). *Apology of Quadratus and Apology of Aristides for the Christians presented to Hadrian (about this time).*
- 129 Hadrian at Athens. Builds the 'city of Hadrian' there opposite the 'city of Theseus'.
- 131 Great revolt of Jews under Bar-Cocheba. P. Saluius Iulianus (praetor urbanus) issues the final edition of the 'edictum perpetuum', known afterwards as 'edictum Saluianum'.
- 135 Jewish insurrection suppressed.
- 136 Hadrian adopts L. Ceionius Commodus, whose daughter is betrothed to M. Annii Verus. Death of the empress Sabina.

### 185. ANTONINUS PIUS, M. AURELIUS AND L. VERUS.

- 138 Death of Hadrian's adopted son. Hadrian adopts T. Aurelius Antoninus, who had adopted his nephew M. Annii Verus (Marcus Aurelius) and also the son of L. Ceionius Commodus (Lucius Verus). Death of Hadrian (10 July). Succession of Antoninus, surnamed 'Pius' by the Senate.
- 139 Hadrian deified, against the Senators' wishes.
- 141 Death of the empress Faustina, in whose honour endowments are created for the nurture of poor girls ('Faustinianae').
- 143 Lollius Urbicus defeats the Brigantes and constructs a line of defensive works between Forth and Clyde (the 'wall of Antoninus').
- 145 Marriage of M. Aurelius and the younger Faustina.
- 147 M. Aurelius receives the 'imperium proconsulare', the 'tribunicia potestas', and the 'ius quintae relationis'.
- 150 *Justin's first defence of the Christians, addressed to Antoninus, M. Aurelius and L. Verus.*
- 154 War with Parthia, concluded in the year following.
- 160 *Justin's second Apology for the Christians, addressed to the Senate.*
- 161 Death and deification of Antoninus, who had named as his successor M. Aurelius. The new emperor names L. Verus as joint-emperor. For the first time two emperors rule the empire together. *The 'Institutiones' of Gaius published.*
- 163 Parthians expelled from Armenia by L. Verus.
- 165 Peace between Rome and Parthia. Widespread pestilence.
- 167 Rising of Marcomanni and barbarian invasions of Dacia, Pannonia, Nōricum and Raetia. M. Aurelius and L. Verus on the Danube. Famine and pestilence prevalent.
- 168 Peace with the barbarians.
- 169 Death and deification of L. Verus. A fresh barbarian invasion threatens Aquileia. The emperor on the Danube. *The 'Noctes Atticae' of Aulus Gellius.*
- 170 The Langobardi appear on the Rhine and the Mauri invade Spain.
- 172 Victories over the Marcomanni and Iazyges.
- 173 Spain harassed by the Mauri.
- 174 Victory over the Quadi (connected with the legend of the 'Thundering legion'). *The 'Meditations' written about this time.*
- 175 Peace with barbarians. Revolt and death of Avidius Cassius in Syria. Death and deification of Faustina.
- 176 The emperor at Antioch, Alexandria and Athens (where chairs of philosophy are endowed by him).
- 178 Rising of Marcomanni and other barbarians.

### 186. FROM THE ACCESSION OF COMMODUS TO THE DEATH OF SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS.

- 180 Death of M. Aurelius, of plague, by the Danube (17 Mar.). Commodus succeeds. Pacification of Daci, Quadi, Iazyges, Vandali. Perennis is Prefect of Praetorians.
- 182 Dacian rising.
- 183 Conspiracy set on foot by the emperor's sister Lucilla; her execution and that of the empress Crispina.
- 185 Perennis executed; Cleander Prefect of the Praetorians.
- 189 Famine at Rome, charged by the populace on Cleander, who is executed.
- 190 Pertinax is 'Praefectus Vrbi'. Many executions.
- 193 Commodus murdered (1 Jan.). Pertinax made emperor, but he is assassinated by the Praetorians (28 Mar.), who give the throne to Didius Iulianus. Pescennius Niger, governor of Syria, named emperor by troops in the East. The legions at Carnuntum proclaim as emperor their general Septimius Seuerus. He reaches Rome (2 June). The Praetorians disbanded and a new body organised. Seuerus offers Albinus, legate in Britain, the title 'Caesar', and marches against Niger, whose forces suffer defeat. Siege of Byzantium begun. Pertinax deified.
- 194 Plautianus is 'Praefectus Praetorio'. Niger crushed at Issus and killed at Antioch.
- 195 Victories of Seuerus over Eastern tribes. He is the first emperor to describe himself as 'proconsul'.
- 196 Capture and punishment of Byzantium. War against Albinus (declared emperor by his troops and supported generally in the West).
- 197 Seuerus defeats Albinus in a great battle near Lugudunum. Death of Albinus. Execution of many sympathisers in the Senate. Britain divided into two provinces. Deification of Commodus. Seuerus goes to the East to attack Parthia.
- 198 Caracalla proclaimed Augustus and his brother Geta, Caesar.
- c. 200 *The 'liber apologeticus' of Tertullian.*
- 202 Seuerus returns to Rome, victorious, but refuses a triumph. Marriage of Caracalla with the daughter of Plautianus.
- 205 Plautianus killed by order of Caracalla, in presence of Seuerus, for alleged conspiracy. Executions of supposed accomplices. The lawyer Papinian succeeds Plautianus as Prefect of the Praetorians. *Birth of Plotinus.*
- 208 Seuerus in Britain, to check invasions from the north.
- 209 Geta proclaimed Augustus.
- 210 Seuerus, after having suffered serious losses, wins some success, followed by a revolt of the Caledonii and Maeatae.
- 211 Seuerus dies at York (4 Feb.). Geta and Caracalla return to Rome.

### 187. FROM CARACALLA TO THE LAST YEAR OF SEVERUS ALEXANDER.

- 212 Murder of Geta, charged with conspiracy. Many executions. Constitution of Caracalla, spreading Roman citizenship over the empire.
- 213 War with German tribes. The Alamanni (who now first appear) defeated.
- 214 Caracalla in Thrace and Asia Minor.
- 215 Caracalla, at Alexandria, orders a great massacre. Completion of his 'Thermae'. He tampers with the coinage.
- 216 Attack on Edessa and Parthia.
- 217 Caracalla murdered near Carrhae, by contrivance of Macrinus, Prefect of Praetorians, who is made emperor by the soldiers. Death of Iulia Domna, widow of Seuerus.

- 218 Macrinus buys peace with Parthia. Some troops set up as emperor Bassianus, grandson of a sister of Iulia Domna, and priest of Elagabalus at Emesa.
- 219 Bassianus (Elägäbälus) reaches Rome (19 Sept.). Temple of the god Elagabalus built at Rome.
- 221 The emperor adopts his cousin Seuerus Alexander (10 July).
- 222 Soldiers, incited by Iulia Mamaea (mother of Seuerus Alexander) kill Elagabalus. Seuerus Alexander succeeds (11 Mar.). Ulpian now Prefect of Praetorians.
- 227 The Sassanid dynasty (Persian) succeeds the Arsacid (Parthian).
- 228 Ulpian killed by Praetorians.
- 231 Persian army in Cappadocia. Alexander heads an expedition which next year fails disastrously.
- 233 Alexander celebrates his 'victories' at Rome and next year leaves with his mother for Germany, to repel an invasion.

# 188. FROM THE DEATH OF SEVERUS ALEXANDER TO THE CAPTURE OF VALERIAN BY THE PERSIANS.

- 235 Soldiers at Moguntiacum kill Alexander and Mamaea (18 Mar.) and select as emperor C. Iulius Verus Maximinus (a Thracian). He has success on the Rhine in this and the next year.
- 238 M. Antonius Gordianus, pro-consul of Africa, declared emperor. He associates his son with himself. They are crushed and killed by the legate of Numidia (6 Ap.). The Senate deifies them and selects two new emperors, M. Clodius Pupienus Maximus to command the legions, and D. Caelius Balbinus to administer civil affairs (16 Ap.). Maximinus killed while besieging Aquileia (17 June). The Praetorians kill Pupienus and Balbinus and raise the third Gordianus (aged 13) to the throne. The Goths cross the Danube for the first time. Barbarians ravage Moesia. *Censorinus* 'de die natali'.
- 242 Victories of Gordianus over Goths and Sarmatae, and next year over Persians.
- 244 Death and deification of Gordianus. Philippus 'the Arabian' succeeds. Peace with Persia.
- 247 Goths in Moesia.
- 248 Dëcius, commander in Moesia, declared emperor, kills Philippus in the following year near Verona. Thousandth anniversary of Rome's foundation celebrated.
- 250 Widespread persecution of Christians by Decius. Plague appears and rages for 15 years.
- 251 Great advance of Goths. Decius perishes on the Danube. Trebonianus Gallus, made emperor, takes as partner a son of Decius (Hostilianus).
- 253 M. Aemilius Aemilianus, commander in Moesia, named emperor by his troops; so also P. Licinius Valerianus (Valerian) in Moesia. Trebonianus Gallus defeated and killed by Aemilianus, who is himself killed soon after. Valerian reaches Rome and is recognised. His son Gallienus declared Augustus.
- 255 Goths invade Illyricum and Macedonia. Progress of other barbarians; Scythians (in Asia Minor) and Alamanni. Sapor, king of Persia, penetrates to Antioch.
- 257 Edict of Valerian against the Christians. Gallienus checks the Alamanni and Aurelian the Goths. Valerian visits the East.
- 258 Troubles with barbarians. Postumus proclaimed emperor in Gaul.
- 259 The Alamanni in Italy; defeated by Gallienus at Milan, and again in Gaul at Aquae Sextiae. Postumus, accepted by the legions of Britain and Spain, establishes the 'imperium Galliarum'.
- 260 Valerian captured by Sapor, who raids Asia Minor but is checked by a Palmyrene force. First edict of toleration for Christians.



### 189. THE ERA OF CONFUSION, TO THE ACCESSION OF DIOCLETIAN.

- 261 Several ephemeral emperors. Successes of Odaenathus, the general of Palmyra, against Sapor. Franks take Tarrāco (about this time).  
 262 Scythians pillage Ephesus. Honours bestowed by Gallienus on Odaenathus, now recognised as king of Palmyra.  
 265 Attack on Postumus by Gallienus fails. Victories of Postumus over the Franks.  
 267 The Goths make their début as pirates, attack Illyricum and besiege Thessalonica. Odaenathus assassinated. A new pretender, Aureôlus, marches on Rome, but fails. The Hérûli taken into Roman service.  
 268 Postumus and Gallienus perish. M. Aurelius Claudius, the survivor of a number of pretenders, becomes emperor and defeats the Alamanni heavily by the Lago di Garda.  
 269 Ravages by Goths. Zênôbia (widow of Odaenathus) seizes Egypt.  
 270 Claudius dies of plague at Sirmium. His brother is chosen at Rome as successor, but is soon killed. Aurelian, proclaimed at Sirmium, is hard pressed by barbarians, and abandons the left bank of the Danube; also recognises Zenobia's conquests. *Death of Plotinus*.  
 271 Barbarians invade Italy, and are defeated by Aurelian. Probus recovers Egypt. Aurelian begins the construction of a new wall round Rome.  
 272 Aurelian defeats Zenobia, and captures Palmyra. Zenobia pardoned.  
 273 Revolt of Palmyra, which is destroyed by Aurelian. Two pretenders, Firmus in Africa and Tetricus in Gaul, are overcome.  
 274 Birth of Constantine. Temple of the Sun built at Rome. Decree against Christians. Sanguinary disorders in Rome; many thousands killed.  
 275 Aurelian murdered in Thrace (Jan.). The troops ask the Senate to choose an emperor; Tacitus is elected, but early next year meets his death in Asia.  
 276 Florianus, brother of Tacitus, chosen emperor at Rome; and M. Aurelius Probus by the Eastern legions. Florianus killed at Tarsus.  
 278 Probus beats the Germans and Goths, of whom he takes 16,000 into his service.  
 279 Large settlement of barbarians in Thrace.  
 280 Piracies by Franks. Several pretenders fail.  
 282 Soldiers kill Probus and raise Carus to the throne, but next year, after victories on the Danube and against Persia, he perishes (Dec.).

### 190. THE REIGN OF DIOCLETIAN.

- 284 Diocletian proclaimed emperor. Carinus, the son of Carus, holds Italy, and defeats Diocletian at Margus (in the following year) but is assassinated. The Persians cede Armenia and Mesopotamia.  
 285 Maximian becomes Caesar.  
 286 Diocletian takes the title 'Herculius' and bestows that of 'Iouius' on Maximian, who is now made Augustus, having won victories over the barbarians. Carausius proclaimed emperor in Britain.  
 287 Maximian crushes the Franks.  
 289 Diocletian defeats the Sarmātae.  
 290 Maximian recognises Carausius as lord of Britain.  
 291 Franks settled in Gaul by Maximian. Reform of the silver coinage.  
 293 Two Caesars appointed, Galerius and Constantius Chlorus, the former to serve under Diocletian in the Eastern half of the empire, the latter under Maximian in the Western half. Allectus kills Carausius and takes his place.  
 295 *Arnobius 'Aduersus nationes'*.  
 c. 296 Persians defeat Galerius. Constantius makes an end of Allectus.

- 297 Great and successful operations against Persia. The subdivision of the old provinces is made about this time. Galerius persecutes Christians.
- 301 Diocletian's great edict fixing the prices of commodities.
- 303 General persecution of Christians begins.

#### 191. STRUGGLES FOR ASCENDANCY AND FINAL SUCCESS OF CONSTANTINE.

- 305 Diocletian and Maximian abdicate; Galerius and Constantius become Augusti; Flavius Seuerus and Maximinus Daia made Caesars. Persecution relaxed in the East; ceases about this time in the West.
- 306 Constantius dies at York. Disputes about the succession bring on civil war. Galerius recognises Seuerus, while Constantine (son of Constantius) is Caesar. Maxentius, son of Maximian, proclaimed Augustus at Rome (27 Oct.), but Maximian comes out of retirement and is recognised as Augustus again. Seuerus defeated and killed by Maxentius. Maximian quarrels with his son, and flees; then weds his daughter to Constantine, on whom he bestows the title of Augustus. Licinius appointed Augustus.
- 307-310 *Lactantius, 'Divinae Institutiones'.*
- 308 Maximinus named Augustus by his troops. Maximian proclaims himself an independent Augustus at Arles; is captured by Constantine and pardoned.
- 310 Maximian, disloyal to Constantine, is forced to kill himself. Constantine, after a great victory over Germans (27 June), crosses to Britain.
- 311 Edict of Toleration by Galerius, Constantine and Licinius. Death of Galerius (5 May). Maximinus drives Licinius out of Asia.
- 312 Conversion of Constantine. His defeat of Maxentius at the 'Pons Muluius'. Suicide of Maxentius. Abolition of Praetorians. Reform of gold coinage.
- 313 Constantine and Licinius at Milan decree religious freedom. Final defeat of Maximinus by Licinius at Adrianople. His death and that of Diocletian.
- 314 Constantine defeats Licinius twice, and makes peace, gaining large territories.
- 315 The arch of Constantine set up at Rome, to commemorate his presence there.
- 317 Three new Caesars; Constantine's sons Crispus and Constantinus, and Licinianus, son of Licinius.
- 322 Great defeat by Constantine of Sarmatae and Goths.
- 323 War between Constantine and Licinius, who is driven into Asia Minor.
- 324 Final defeat of Licinius at Chrysopolis, and his execution.

#### 192. FROM THE SUPREMACY OF CONSTANTINE TO THE DEATH OF JULIAN.

- 325 Council of Nicaea, with Constantine as president.
- 326 Execution of the empress Fausta, the emperor's son Crispus, and his nephew Licinianus, son of Licinius. Constantine in Rome.
- 330 Byzantium becomes the new capital, Constantinopolis.
- 332 Goths, numbering 40,000, enter Roman service as 'foederati'.
- 334 More than 300,000 Sarmatae settled within the empire.
- 335 Constantine appoints as heirs to the empire his three sons and a nephew, Dalmatius.
- 337 Baptism of Constantine. His death (22 May). Massacre of members of the imperial family (including Dalmatius). The three sons of Constantine recognised as Augusti (Constantinus, Constans, Constantius).
- 338 The three Augusti meet and define their territories.
- 340 Constans defeats and kills Constantine II and annexes his dominions.
- 343 Constans in Britain. The basilica of Sancta Sophia built at Constantinople.

- 350 Magnentius assumes the purple in Gaul, drives Constans to his death and enters Rome (Aug.), having overcome the pretender Vetranio.
- 351 Gallus, nephew of Constantine I and brother of Julian, made Caesar. Great defeat of Magnentius by Constantius at Mursa (28 Sept.).
- 353 Magnentius kills himself in Gaul.
- 354 Gallus fails in an insurrection and is executed.
- 355 Julian marries the sister of Constantius and is sent to Gaul, and the Rhine, where he wins victories.
- 359 War with Persia.
- 360 Julian made Caesar. *The 'Caesares' of Aurelius Victor ends with this year.*
- 361 Death of Constantius in Asia (3 Nov.). Julian enters Constantinople as emperor (11 Dec.) and re-establishes heathen cults.
- 363 Julian mortally wounded in the war against Persia. Jovianus (Jovian), raised to the throne by soldiers, establishes Christianity again.

### 193. FROM THE MURDER OF JOVIAN TO THE DEATH OF THEODOSIUS.

- 364 Jovian murdered (16 Feb.). Valentinian and his brother Valens become Augusti.
- 365 Procopius proclaimed emperor at Constantinople, but killed next year.
- 369 Valentinian names his son Gratianus (Gratian) as Augustus. Sanguinary conflicts between Damasus and Vrsinus, claimants to the papacy. Severe struggles with Germans and other barbarians in this and the following ten years. *The 'Breviarium' of Eutropius.*
- 375 Death of Valentinian. His young son Valentinian II becomes Augustus.
- 378 The death of Valens. *Close of the History of Ammianus Marcellinus.* Theodosius given a command on the Danube. Edict of Gratian in favour of religious freedom, with few exceptions.
- 379 Theodosius made an Augustus. *Ausonius Consul.*
- c. 380 *Dramatic date of the 'Saturnalia' of Macrobius. Jerome translates and continues (from 326 to 378) the chronicle of Eusebius.*
- 381 Goths admitted by Theodosius into the Danube legions.
- 382 Removal of the altar of Victory from the Roman Senate-house by Gratian.
- 383 Arcadius, son of Theodosius, made an Augustus. A pretender, Maximus, secures Britain, Gaul and Spain and is recognised by Theodosius. Gratian dies.
- 384-5 *The 'Relationes' of Symmachus, prefect of Rome.*
- 386 *Ambrose, 'De officiis ministrorum'.*
- 387 Maximus in Italy. Flight of Valentinian II.
- 388 Maximus defeated and killed by Theodosius. Valentinian II again emperor of the West.
- 389 Triumphal entry of Theodosius into Rome, with his son Honorius, and Valentinian.
- 390 Great massacre perpetrated by Theodosius at Thessalonica. He submits to Ambrose and does penance.
- 391 Paganism forbidden. Temple of Serapis at Alexandria destroyed.
- 392 Valentinian murdered. Eugenius (a 'grammaticus') promoted to be an Augustus by Arbogast, the barbarian commander. Victory of Stilicho over Goths, Alans and Huns. *Jerome's 'De uiris illustribus'.*
- 394 Theodosius crushes Eugenius, and visits Rome. Honorius declared emperor of the West, with Stilicho as general.

194. FROM THE DEATH OF THEODOSIUS TO THE DEATH OF  
ATTILA.

- 395 Death of Theodosius (17 Jan.). Arcadius emperor of the East. Fall and death of Rufinus, the great minister of Theodosius. Goths under Alaric in Greece.
- 396 Alaric defeated in Greece by Stilicho.
- 398 Gildo, tyrant in Africa for twelve years, crushed and killed by Stilicho, whose daughter marries Honorius.
- 399 Fall of Eutropius, minister of Arcadius.
- 400-403 Alaric in Italy.
- 402-3 Alaric defeated by Stilicho at Pollentia and again near Verona.
- 403 *Close of the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus.*
- 404 Honorius transfers his court to Ravenna.
- 405-6 Radagaisus invades Italy; his army destroyed by Alaric.
- 407 Ravages of barbarians in Gaul. Revolt of Britain under the pretender Constantine, who receives support in Gaul and Spain.
- 408 Disgrace and death of Stilicho (23 Aug.). Alaric besieges Rome but accepts ransom. Death of Arcadius. Accession of the younger Theodosius in the East. c. 408 *Death of Claudian.*
- 409 Second siege of Rome. Goths and Romans join in raising Attalus, Prefect of the City, to the throne. The Vandals and other Germans invade Spain. Revolt of Britain against Constantine.
- 410 Honorius degraded by Alaric. Capture and sack of Rome by Goths. Death of Alaric. c. 410 *Death of Prudentius.*
- 411 Constantine killed. Britain and Gaul in revolt for many years.
- 413 Defeat of Heraclian, count of Africa.
- 414 Atulf, the Visigothic king, marries the sister of Honorius, but dies next year.
- 416 *Itinerary of Rutilius Namatianus.*
- 417 *Orosius' 'History of the world' ends with this year.*
- 419-451 Theodoric king of the Visigoths in Gaul.
- 420-451 Franks on the lower Rhine under Merovingian kings.
- 425-455 Valentinian III emperor of the West.
- 426 *Completion of Augustine's 'De civitate Dei'.*
- 429 Vandals in Africa.
- 433-453 Attila king of the Huns. Aetius minister of the Western Empire.
- 439-451 *Salvianus writes his 'De gubernatione Dei' between these dates.*
- 439 Carthage captured by Vandals. *The work of Martianus Capella on the 'Seven Arts' was written before this event.*
- c. 441 Huns ravage the Eastern Empire.
- 446 Peace between Attila and the Eastern Empire.
- 451 Attila invades Gaul. Theodoric and Aetius defeat him near Châlons. Theodoric killed in the battle.
- 452 Attila ravages Italy, but makes peace.
- 453 Death of Attila.

## 195. FROM THE DEATH OF ATTILA TO THE DEATH OF JUSTINIAN.

- 453-466 Theodoric II king of the Visigoths.
- 454 Murder of Aetius.
- 455 Sack of Rome by Vandals. Death of Valentinian III. *Auilius places in the library of Trajan a statue of his son-in-law Sidonius Apollinaris.*
- 456 Dominance of Ricimer in Italy begins.
- 472 Sack of Rome by Ricimer and his death.



- 476 Augustulus, last emperor of the West.  
 476-485 Euric king of the Visigoths.  
 476-493 Odovacar king in Italy.  
 481-512 Clovis king of the Franks. His conversion (496).  
 489 Theodoric the Ostrogoth invades Italy and defeats Odovacar at Verona.  
 493-526 Theodoric king of Italy after the assassination of Odovacar (493).  
 524 *Boëthius writes the 'Philosophiae Consolatio' shortly before his death.*  
 526-7 *Priscian's great work on Grammar is transcribed at Constantinople by one of his pupils, the calligrapher Theodorus.*  
 527-565 Reign of Justinian.  
 528-9 Code of Justinian.  
 529 *The monastery of Monte Cassino founded by Benedict of Nursia.*  
 530-533 Digest of Justinian.  
 533 Belisarius, general of Justinian, overthrows the Vandals in Africa and annexes it (534).  
 536 Belisarius occupies Rome (10 Dec.).  
 537-8 Goths besiege Rome. Successes of Belisarius in Italy.  
 538-9 Frankish invasion of Italy. Belisarius overthrows the Gothic kingdom in Italy.  
 540 *Cassiodorus, the historian of the Goths (533) and the Secretary of the Ostrogothic dynasty, retires from public life and founds a monastery in the south of Italy.*  
 541 Belisarius commands against Persia.  
 542 Belisarius disgraced.  
 544-548 Belisarius again in Italy, owing to the successes of Totila, the Gothic king.  
 546 Totila captures Rome; he is driven out in Feb. of the next year by Belisarius, returns and is again defeated; but makes progress in Italy.  
 548 Belisarius recalled; the Goths retake Rome (549).  
 552 Expedition of Narses to Italy. Death of Totila. Narses takes Rome.  
 554 Narses defeats the invading Franks and Alamanni. Exarchs established at Ravenna.  
 559 Last victory of Belisarius; he delivers Constantinople from the Huns.  
 562 Death of Belisarius.  
 565 Death of Justinian.

The following tables of dates are useful, viz. Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. III (Roman History, 280 B.C.—14 A.D.), and *Fasti Romani* (15—578 A.D.); C. Peter's *Zeittafeln der römischen Geschichte*; E. W. Fischer's *Römische Zeittafeln von Roms Gründung bis auf Augustus' Tod*; Zumpt's *Annales Veterum Regnorum et Populorum, imprimis Romanorum*; and Goyau's *Chronologie de l'Empire Romain*, 1891.

## IV. RELIGION AND MYTHOLOGY.

195. THE religion of the Roman people, as we meet it in Roman literature, or in Greek writers of Roman history, can only be described as a medley ; this was the inevitable result of the development of a small Italian City-state into the mistress of a great Empire. It consisted partly of ideas, rites, and priesthoods, surviving from the earliest age of that City-state, which were all of the same type as those of other Italian communities of the same stock as the Roman ; but in the literary age the ideas had become almost extinct, the rites had become in great part fossilised or obsolete, and of the priesthoods only those which had acquired political influence still remained in a flourishing condition. Upon this original religious stratum there had been deposited another, consisting of Greek ideas, deities, and ritual, which had been imported chiefly from the Greek cities of Italy and Sicily with which the Romans came in contact, partly also at second-hand from their neighbours the Etruscans, who had themselves absorbed much of Greek religion and mythology. Thirdly, as early as the second Punic war, Oriental cults had begun to make their appearance at Rome, and in the literary age we continually meet with them.

The religion of  
the Romans.

To treat such a complicated subject adequately in a short chapter is impossible. But some attempt shall be made (1) to give an account of the religious ideas and practice of the early Romans, of the Greek cults superimposed on these, so far as they became a part of the State religious system, and of the decay and revival by Augustus of the old religion ; (2) to introduce the reader to a few of the most famous worships of other Italian cities ; (3) to take a brief survey of the religion of the Etruscans. The Oriental cults must be left out, in order to leave room for a short section on the Roman religious calendar.

### A. THE RELIGION OF THE ROMANS.

197. The religion of the Italians was, like that of the Greeks, in historical times entirely a local one ; *i.e.* the deities worshipped were settled in one spot, house, village or city, to which they exclusively belonged, and where they were propitiated under strictly local forms and by authorised local priesthoods. Thus the Roman *di indigētes*,

Local.

or deities settled within the walls of Rome, or its territory, may fairly be regarded as the divine inhabitants of the city, living among and under the charge of the human inhabitants, whose interests they in their turn looked after, if properly propitiated. The care and propitiation of these deities grew in the hands of the Roman authorities into a system of religious law (*ius sacrum* or *diuinum*), which was a part, and in early times the most important part, of the whole law of the community. How far the same was the case in the other Italian cities we do not know; but it can hardly be doubted that all the peoples who were connected by race with the Romans, viz. Latins, Umbrians, Samnites, &c., and who spoke forms of the same language, were developing on the same lines, civil and religious, as the people that eventually overcame them, and all the evidence we have as to their religious practice confirms this. In any case, the essential point to remember about the religion of the conquerors is that it was a religion of the city, regulated in the strictest manner as regards times, places, and ritual of sacrifice and prayer, by a 'divine law'. This is the Roman religion as we know it in historical times; not a religion of the individual, but of the community; not a matter in which any man was a law to himself, but a system in which the State regulated all his dealings with the supernatural. A glance at what remains of Cicero's work on the constitution (*De Legibus*) will illustrate this well. Cicero, though no believer in the old theology, places the *ius diuinum* in the forefront of his whole description (Bk ii).

198. But the Italian religion was of course much older than the State; in Latin literature the word *religio* not only stands for the feeling of awe which was regulated and relieved by the *ius diuinum* of the city, but leads us back through clan and family to a time when the Italian peoples were settling in the land, struggling with the dangers and difficulties that beset them in forest and marsh, and finding enemies, human, animal, and spiritual at every turn. And in order to understand the ideas that really lay at the root of the Italian religion, we must glance back at these beginnings of their civilisation. Though we must always think of the Roman religion as essentially the *ius diuinum* of the Roman State, we must also think of it as superimposed on an earlier stratum of religious thought, whose characteristics it in some degree retained in its cult; and it is exactly the combination of these earlier ideas with the work of the State that gave that religion its peculiar character.

199. It seems certain, from numerous indications in the cults of later times, that at this period of settlement the religious ideas of the Italian peoples were in that stage when supernatural beings or powers (*numina*) are believed to exist in natural objects such as trees, stones, springs, animals, &c.; of great gods in our sense of the word they knew little or nothing; even Jupiter himself in the earliest form in which he was worshipped at Rome resided in an oak on the Capitoline hill (*Iup. Fereetrius*). It is in fact necessary to rid the mind once and for all of the idea, conveyed both by Greek and Roman

Numina in  
Nature.

literature, that each deity was a clearly recognised personality with distinct attributes. The Italian settler lived in a world of spirits which might do him good or harm, and his first task was to induce them to do him good, to reclaim them as it were, and bring them into the service of man. This was his one great care, and it explains why his religion was at all times a purely practical one, adjusted to man's daily needs in family or city, and why he developed no real mythology. He was not interested in these spirits except so far as they could do him good or harm; he never let his fancy play with them, or deal with them as if they were creatures of his own kind, marrying or having children, going to war, or having adventures. They were beings whose undefined nature made them hard to deal with, to propitiate with certainty or security; their very names, their sex, their powers and wishes, were all matter of doubt and anxiety. It was only by a slow process of patient experience, of tradition handed down from one generation to another, that the right forms of invocation could be acquired, and the supernatural beings brought into satisfactory relation with man on the land of his settlement. This process, which doubtless began with the family, eventually emerges in the City-state as that *ius diuinum* spoken of above, which regulated the worship and relieved the anxiety of the civilised Latin, just as the *ius civile* regulated his relations with his fellow-citizens, and relieved him from anxiety as to their conduct towards him. The practical nature of the Roman religion, its freedom from mythological fancy, and its essentially legal character, are all to be explained only by reference to the belief of the primitive Italian in a dangerous spirit-world around him.

200. The religion of the Roman family and farm, which may stand for those of Italy generally, will serve to show that this process of systematisation had gone some way, long before the State was reached. In the house, Vesta, the spirit of the hearth-fire, the Penates, the spirits of the store-closet, and Janus, the spirit of the doorway (if this be the right explanation of that famous deity), are all established, and may indeed have been so before the Italians reached Italy; these were all worshipped daily, on rising and at meals, by the farmer and his family, and specially invoked, with other deities, at birth, puberty, and marriage. Outside on the land, the Lar and his cult had been fixed at the point where the arable of the farm met those of other cultivators (*compitum*), and had not yet found his way into the house. The boundary of the farm land, where it ran with the woodland, was the haunt of the woodland spirit Silvanus, probably a form of the great spirit Mars, who was to control the destinies of Rome in later times; and it is worthy of note that Silvanus remained throughout Roman history, and in all parts of the Roman Empire, the guardian of the boundaries (*tutor finium*), half-reclaimed and half-savage. The boundary itself was marked and protected from evil things natural and supernatural by the ritual of *lustratio*, or the procession from point to point of victims

Religion of the  
family and  
farm.



(ox, sheep, and pig), the produce of the farm, destined to be sacrificed with fixed forms of prayer. The ritual was in the hands of the *paterfamilias*, who was in fact the priest of the family, as he continued to be throughout Roman history. Fear, anxiety, scruple (*religio* in its strict sense), are already mitigated by settlement and routine; yet, even in such a simple life, man must continually meet with new experiences, and every incursion of an enemy, or attack of mildew on the corn, or disease of cattle and sheep, might plunge the farmer into fresh alarm as to his relations with the spirits about him. The fire on the hearth might go out, or the ghosts of members of the family slain by enemies or wild beasts, and never buried with the proper rites in the authorised place, might return to the dwelling, and need to be expelled by the proper process.

201. Of the intermediate stages between the life of the family and that of the State we know but little. When the State first meets our view, as the city of the four Servian regions, it appears in full religious panoply; and the one object of this complete armour, the *ius divinum* of a civilised community, is to protect the community and all its members from the harm that might be done them by enemies of all kinds human and divine, and to relieve them from all scruple and anxiety by systematising and controlling the worship of those *numina*, now growing perhaps into *dei*, who had been induced to take up their residence within the sacred boundary. We must take a rapid glance at this religious armour of the State by describing briefly (1) the priest-hoods; (2) the deities and their festivals; (3) the holy places; (4) the ritual used in worship. These cover fairly well the whole of the religious practice of the Romans throughout their history; and beyond practice they never went. Enough has been said to show that there was nothing in this religion of a spiritual character; its object was not to make men spiritually good, but to protect them from material evil; for that purpose practice (cult) would suffice, without doctrine or exhortation to right doing. As Cicero said, the Roman did not ask the gods to make him virtuous, but to give him health and wealth. Practice can only produce *virtus* in the sense of obedience to rule and law; and so far only this religion had an ethical result.

202. (1) At the head of the whole system was the *Rex*, who represented in the State the position of the *paterfamilias* in the family, and had certain sacrificial functions. The hearth-fire of the State was cared for by the Vestal Virgins, who never ceased to perform this duty throughout Roman history; they represented the daughters of the primitive regal family, and the site of their cult was next to the king's house (*regia*). Other special cults were in the charge of priests called *Flamines*, of whom the chief were the Flamens of Jupiter (*Flamen Dialis*), Mars, and Quirinus; the first of these was placed under very peculiar restrictions, which point to a very primitive combination of religious and political ideas. Besides these helpers the *Rex* had a *collegium* of advisers skilled in

the *ius diuinum*, called for some uncertain reason *pontifices*, three or perhaps five in number; when the kingship was abolished this college gradually gained great power, and had charge of the calendar, the archives, and all matters relating to burials, wills, and adoptions, which gave them great authority in the private life of the citizens. Their numbers were gradually increased to fifteen, and at their head was the *pontifex maximus*, who must have taken over the chief part of the religious power of the king, lived officially in the *regia*, and was armed with *auspicium*; he was in fact a magistrate, and in some ways the most important personage in the State, as may be seen from the fact that Augustus (from B.C. 12) and all his successors allowed no one else to hold the office. For advice in all matters of divination, an art cultivated with great persistency in all Italy, the king had a *collegium* of augurs, who like the pontifices were increased under the Republic to fifteen (under the Empire to sixteen), and also came to wield important political influence. A college of *fetiales* assisted the king in what we may call international matters, such as the declaration of war, and there were other priesthoods of special character, such as the Arval Brethren, the *Salii*, *Luperci*, &c. But these had a tendency to become gradually obsolete as Rome grew to be an imperial State, while the pontifices and augurs, who combined legal and political functions with religious ones, always retained their importance. One other great college was added at the outset of the Republic, to take charge of the Sibylline books lately introduced at Rome; and as the consultation of these books constantly resulted in the introduction of new deities and new forms of worship, especially Greek, the *duoviri* (later *quindecimviri*) *sacris faciundis*, as they were called, took charge, though always under the general supervision of the *pontifices*, of the details of all such innovations. From this condensed account of the priesthoods it will be seen that the religious armour of the State was of a most elaborate character, and that the individual citizen had only to submit himself to those in authority over him to feel secure in all his relations with the supernatural. It is probable that the habit of obedience, of trust in authority, which went far to make the Romans supreme in the world, was largely the result of this elaborate systematisation of their religious life; while at the same time it is certain that this very systematisation gradually stifled and killed what may be called the really religious aspect of their religion.

203. (2) The history of the Roman Pantheon, like that of the Roman city and the Roman law, is a story of accretion from without, rather than of development from within. Reflected in it we see not only the character and habits of life of the original Romans, but their experience as they developed their strength, their contact with other peoples, their disasters and their triumphs. The convenient distinction made by the later Romans between the *di indigētes*, deities of the earliest City-state, and *di nouensiles*, 'new settlers'—gods introduced from without, is our best guide in sketching it.

Deities.

The *di indigētes* can be discerned in the ancient calendar of festivals (see below), marked with large letters in all the fragmentary *Di indigētes*. Fasti of the Augustan age. Only a few are familiar to us; most of them had become dim or obsolete in the age of Roman literature, which simply means that the life of the people had changed, and that they needed them no more. Only the fittest survived; Vesta has already been mentioned, and to her we must add the nameless Penates of the State, and Janus who resided in the sacred gate of the Forum: the three together reminding us of the worship of the family, on which that of the earliest State was modelled. Jupiter, the god of the sky and of lightning, as he was for all Italians, resided on the Capitoline hill as *Feretrius*, the striker; and also Juno, the special deity of women. Mars, another Italian god, was from the first and always remained the most characteristic deity of the Roman people and their city; he was the warlike deity of the warm season of arms, which is also the season of the growth and harvesting of the crops, and he thus suggests the life of a community which, in the words of Virgil, 'armati terram exercent'. It was natural that they should connect him with the foundation-legends of their city. His sacred spears were kept in the Regia and 'shaken' at the beginning of every war with the invocation, 'Mars uigila'; and his warrior priests, the *Salii*, performed wild dances, armed with his shields (*ancilia*), during the month of March, which still bears his name. Of the other *di indigētes* and their festivals only one thing can be said here, viz. that they prove beyond doubt that the earliest Romans were an agricultural people; most of the festivals clearly reflect the processes of agriculture, and so no doubt would the deities, if we knew more of their original nature. The evidence available goes to show that they were not distinctly conceived personalities, but functional *numina*, or powers working within a definite sphere of action which is indicated by the adjectival form of the name (Saeturnus, Siluanus, Portunus), or by cult-titles in adjectival form (Ops Consiua, Iuppiter Feretrius), or the name represents the object in which the spirit is supposed to reside or work (Rōlugus, Terminus). The deities of the *Indigitamenta*, or priestly list of *numina* to be invoked at all important moments of human life (e.g. Cūnina, the cradle deity; Iterdūca, who attended children to school, and so on), seem to represent a stage of religious organisation when this functional conception of divinity was carried logically to an extreme point. The main result of this habit of thought was that (as Aust has well said) the deities never advance to an independent personal existence, but remain cold and colourless conceptions,—*numina*. Their whole activity consists in the service of man, and man is only interested in them in so far as he is interested in that service. Hence the absence of mythology, which in Italy, so far as it existed at all, was occupied rather with man and his works,—such as the founding of cities,—than with the gods; hence too the priestly elaboration of ritual, based on the idea that the *numen* will only exercise his function, if the work of propitiation,—man's part of the bargain,—is carried out with the utmost exactness.

204. Before leaving the *di indigētes* a word must be said about the *Di Manes*, the spirits of the departed. These seem not to have been individualised, but thought of as a whole; though the bodies or ashes of the individuals lay in the city of the dead, outside the walls of the city of the living, the spirits were on three days of the year believed to revisit the upper world by the removal of a stone (*lapis mănālis*) which kept them below the earth. Whether there was at Rome, at any rate in the earliest period, anything in the nature of a *worship* of the dead is extremely doubtful. No such worship is recorded of the Lemuria in May, which is probably the oldest festival of the dead in the Calendar; all we know of it shows us only the primitive practice of getting ghosts to leave the house by quasi-magical rites. The festival of the dead in February (Parentalia, culminating in Feralia on Feb. 21) seems to have been a yearly renewal of the rites of burial. On the 22nd followed the Caristia, a family festival which finds no place in the State calendar; it is described by Ovid as a reunion of the living members of the family after they have discharged their duties to the dead. Thus it does not seem possible to prove from the cult that the dead were really regarded as objects of worship; the subject is a difficult one, and must here be left unsolved.

205. The catalogue of deities brought to Rome from without, or superimposed on the indistinctly conceived native ones, is too long even to be condensed here. But every such introduction meant something,—a new experience or need in the life of the nation, and repays the most careful investigation of even the meagre records we possess. The Latins of the Campagna, the Greeks of Magna Graecia, the Etruscans, and eventually the peoples of the East, all contributed; even in the time of the later kings, Diana of Aricia had come as the representative of a new political relation with Latium; the Greek Hercules arrived with the traders of the Greek cities in Italy; Minerva from Falerii with Etruscan craftsmen and musicians. Thus the old religion was early supplemented in politics, trade, and art; and at the close of the regal period the growing idea of the greatness of the Roman State,—an intuition, as it might almost seem, of the dominion that was to be, took shape in the cult of Jupiter on the Capitol in a new and splendid temple and with the new cult-titles of ‘the best and greatest’ (*optimus maximus*). This great god was destined henceforward to represent the greatness of Rome in the mind of every citizen, and was never really superseded by the temporary popularity of any rival. The fact that he was associated in the temple with Juno and Minerva, after the Etruscan fashion, shows that the stimulus may have been given by Etruscan influence, but like Westminster Abbey, built by a half-French king and by French architects, the Capitoline temple always remained the essential religious centre of a nation. Yet it was from this same temple that, by an irony of fate, the decrees were to issue, which, in the course of the next three centuries, took the life out of the old genuine religion of the Roman State. We have seen that the



mysterious Sibylline books were deposited in it, the keepers of which, under decree of the Senate, consulted them from time to time, and ordered the introduction of new worship, and, as we shall see, of new ritual. As a rule the new deities, Greek for the most part, appeared under Italian names, but there is never any doubt as to their origin. Apollo, who had already been known both at Rome and in Etruria, retained his Greek name; but Demeter soon appears under the name of Ceres, and reflects the growing plebeian population of the city by her connexion with the corn trade from Magna Graecia and Sicily; Hermes, under the Italian name Mercurius, also indicates the presence of a trading population; the old Italian god, Neptunus, takes on the attributes of Poseidon; the constant pestilences bring Aesculapius, whose Greek name is latinised, no doubt because the Romans had no recognised art nor deity of healing; and all these new arrivals bring with them new ideas of divinity not native in Italian soil. The Romans now become used to the sight of deities in human form, to statues placed in temples and carried about the streets, like the Saints of the Italy of to-day; the old spiritual or daemonistic conception of the supernatural gradually dies out, in spite of some effort of the *pontifices* to maintain it. The long list is closed in the year 205 B.C. by the advice of the Sibylline books that the Magna Mater of the Phrygians should be induced to come to Rome; and the story of her arrival in the form of her fetish-stone is at once one of the most picturesque and one of the saddest in the history of religion at Rome. Thus, by the end of the Hannibalic war, the divine population of Rome may be called as much a *colluvies nationum* as the human; and the City-state of antiquity could no longer continue to exist under such conditions. The decay of the old religion marks accurately the decay of the Roman City-state; the failure to trust, or care for, the *di indigetes* was a sure sign that the State was passing into a new phase. In the two centuries that followed the great struggle with Hannibal Rome gained the world and lost her own soul.

206. (3) By the word 'holy' we inadequately render what the Romans

expressed in two distinct words, *religiosus* and *sacer*; and, applied to places, these words almost exactly indicate the

difference between the natural feeling of awe felt in approaching a spot where a spirit is supposed to dwell, and the belief of the citizen of a State that his State-officials have taken the place in hand, and made it the property of the deity by certain legal formulae, thus changing undefined fear into definite confidence. Thus places struck by lightning, or the *lacus Curtius* in the Forum, were *loca religiosa*, because they had not been subjected to the processes of *dedicatio* or *consecratio*, though they were under the care of the *pontifices*, and the same was the case with the resting-places of the dead. A *locus sacer* on the other hand was a spot which had been dedicated and consecrated to a deity, with the proper rites, by the *pontifices*. The oldest places of this kind were the Aedes Vestae (which exactly represents the most primitive form of Italian house), the arch of

Janus in the Forum, the cave of the Lupercal, and many hallowed spots, on which altars had been erected, enclosed by a low wall. The general word for such places was *fanum*; if an altar was erected, it was termed *sacellum*, i.e. an enclosed altar without a roof, and there were many such *loca sacra* in the city as late as the time of Augustus. To make it into a *templum*, the technical process of *inauguratio* by the augurs was also necessary (Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, iii 407). When site and building had been dedicated, consecrated, and inaugurated, it was not only the dwelling and property of the deity, but was in all respects of good omen, and might be used with confidence even for secular purposes, such as the assembling of the Senate; and a *lex templi* recording these processes, as well as other matters relating to the temple and its property, was inscribed on its walls. The great temples erected in the age of the Republic were nearly all of them *templa* in the strict sense of the word; many of them were no doubt built on the site of older *sacella*. For the plan and arrangement of Roman temples the reader is referred to the chapter on Architecture (vii 1).

207. (4) With the Romans, as with other peoples, the ritual of worship consisted of sacrifice and prayer; the two being, so far as we know, always combined. *Sacrificium* was the act of making over to the deity some property of the worshipper; *sacrum* being 'that which belongs to a deity'. The nature of the sacrifice depended partly on the function of the particular deity, partly on the object aimed at by the sacrificer. Thus the Roman husbandman offered the firstfruits of all crops to the *numina* concerned with their welfare; at the Vestalia in June, a festival preliminary to the harvest, the Vestals offered sacred cakes, made in antique fashion, of ears of corn which they had already plucked in May: at the Parilia in April, baskets of millet, cakes, and pails of milk, were offered to Pales, the deity of husbandmen. But the available evidence shows that animal sacrifices were also in use from the earliest times, as we might expect from the nature of Italian husbandry, which was always largely occupied with the rearing of stock. The wealth of the old Roman farmer consisted chiefly of cattle, and in State-festivals we find ox, sheep, and pig as victims, all three together (*suovetaurilia*) in some well-known rites, such as the Ambarvalia. The pig however, as the less honourable animal, was rarely used apart from the other two, except in expiatory sacrifices (*piacula*). As in Greece, male victims were offered to male deities and female victims to goddesses, in historical times; and each deity had a favourite victim, e.g. Janus preferred a ram, Jupiter a white heifer, Robigus a red dog, Mars the combination of ox, sheep, and pig, and, at the curious festival of this god on October 15, a war-horse was sacrificed in a peculiar manner.

Ritual of  
worship.

208. The ritual of the altar was often extremely elaborate. All that need here be said is that the victim (*uictima*, if a large animal; *hostia*, if a sheep), which must be unblemished, was slain by the assistants of the priest, after its head had been sprinkled with wine and with fragments of the sacred

cake (*mola salsa*, whence the word *immolatio*). In all ordinary sacrifices the internal organs, and especially the liver, were carefully examined, and if of good omen, and such as would satisfy the deity, were placed upon the altar (*porrectio*), while the rest of the animal was eaten. The prayer was probably said at this point; the priest, or whoever was the sacrificer, said it with his head covered, in order to shut out evil influences from his eyes, and under his breath (*tacitus*), while a *tibicen* played the *tibia* to drown all ill-omened sounds: the bystanders kept meanwhile a strict silence. The prayer was the expression of a desire, perhaps almost a claim, on the part of the worshippers, that the deity would further their interests in some matter within the range of his activity, either by averting evil or doing positive good; there is no trace in the Roman religion of prayer for other than material blessings. To obtain the desired result, every detail of the ritual had to be gone through correctly; any mistake or accidental hindrance made it necessary to begin the whole process over again (*instaurare*), and to offer an expiatory sacrifice (*piaculum*). This was usually a pig, which was sacrificed with exactly the same ritual as the ordinary victim. On great occasions such a *piaculum* was offered the day before the festival, in order to expiate any omission that might happen the next day: it was then called a *porcus praecidaneus*.

209. The most beautiful and interesting of all the Roman acts of worship, which is found elsewhere in Italy, as at Iguvium (see § 216), is that called *lustratio*, which was used whenever city, army, crops, or flocks had to be purified or protected from evil influences. Apart from certain quaint and primitive rites of this kind in use at the Lupercalia and the Parilia, which survive from the oldest Palatine settlement, the typical *lustratio* consisted of a procession which went round the object to be purified, stopping at particular well-marked spots, and offering there sacrifices and prayer. The idea seems to have been that the circuit taken was a boundary within which no evil could come, if the victims before their slaughter were driven round it according to the prescribed order. As described in Cato, *de agri cultura*, and also by Virgil<sup>1</sup>, the *lustratio* of the farm consisted of a procession which went round the fields when the crops were ripening; the sacrifices in this case took place at the end of the third round, and a prayer was offered for the protection of the farmer and his *familia*, as well as of the farm itself, including the pasture as well as the arable. The actual words of this prayer may be read in the 141st chapter of Cato's work.

210. With the introduction of Greek deities in the first age of the Republic, there came in also the *Græcus ritus*, which the Romans always carefully distinguished from their own ritual. The only detail of it which we know for certain is that the head of the sacrificer was in this case uncovered; but with it, and under the influence of the Sibylline books and their keepers, there came also other ceremonies, the most famous of which was the *lectisternum*. This was seen for the first time in 399 B.C.,

<sup>1</sup> Georg. i 338 f.

when Apollo and Latona, Hercules and Diana (Artemis), Mercurius and Neptunus (Hermes and Poseidon) were exhibited reclining on couches in the Greek fashion, and seeming to partake of a meal laid out in front of each of them, as they reposed with their left arms on cushions (*pulvinaria*). Here the whole population of the city might share in the rites, while, in the strictly Roman ritual, only the sacrificing priest officiated and entered the temple. These innovations mark the first appearance of a tendency, constantly recurring in Roman history, to seek for a more emotional expression of religious feeling than was afforded by the old forms of sacrifice and prayer. In Livy's account of the *lectisternia*<sup>1</sup> we seem to discern something in the nature of a sense of sin, or at least of pollution, something wrong in the relation of the State to the supernatural: a *religio*, or feeling of fear and awe, which the old Roman rites were not adequate to soothe.

211. We have seen that, during the first period of the Republic, new deities were introduced from Italy and Greece, with new methods of ritual, temples on the Greek or Etruscan model, and one new priesthood of great importance. It is therefore not astonishing to find that, in the last two centuries of the Republican era, and after the war with Hannibal, the genuine old Roman deities, with their rites and priesthoods, began to suffer neglect. Their decay was hastened also by the influence of Greek philosophy, by the introduction of Oriental worships, such as that of Cybele, and afterwards of Isis, and by the presence in the city of Rome of an ever-increasing population of foreigners or of manumitted slaves. The result of this was, that when the Republic came to an end, even scholars like Varro were often entirely in the dark as to the original function of many old Roman deities, as to the nature and meaning of their cults, and even as to the meaning of the names of festivals, such as Agonia, Lucaria, Poplifugia, &c. While the political priesthoods, the *pontifices*, augurs, and *quindecimviri*, who were intimately concerned with the public law of the State, continued to flourish and to exercise important political powers, the oldest priesthoods, with the exception of the Vestal Virgins, fell into neglect: it is almost certain, for example, that, in the years between 87 and 11 B.C., there was no *Flamen Dialis*. It may seem almost impossible that these ancient religious institutions, and to some extent probably even the belief in them, should have been capable of resuscitation at the hands of an individual, even though he represented, as Augustus did, the best interests and the collective wisdom of the State. But this wonderful task was actually carried out by Augustus, though in combination with a new feature,—the worship of the gods of his own family.

The explanation is to be found in the fact that it was not too late to revive the idea, common to ancient City-states, that the prosperity, the physical efficiency, and the morality of a State, were all intimately bound

Decay of the  
State religion,  
and its revival  
by Augustus.

<sup>1</sup> V 13, cp. vii 2, xxii 10.



up with the attention paid by that State to the divine beings who were interested in it. In all these points the Roman State had long been failing; and, for many years before Augustus was secure in power, a deep depression had affected at least the best part of the population, while on the other hand there was a growing tendency to have recourse to magic, astrology, and what we may call quack-remedies, for the sense of weariness and perhaps of sin,—of neglected duty to the State and its gods. That Augustus deliberately set himself to supplant such illegal treatment by substituting a real *pietas* in the widest sense of that word, no one can doubt who studies the *Aeneid* from this point of view, or carefully weighs the language of the *Carmen Saeculare* of Horace, the hymn written to express the ideas of the master for the great festival (the *ludi saeculares*), which was to inaugurate a new and better era. In this hymn, which we may almost regard as dictated in substance by Augustus himself, the ideas of religion, morality, and fertility are deftly woven together, and seem exactly to express the remedial policy of the Princeps.

212. A few words must suffice for the work actually done by Augustus, for which we have the evidence not only of later writers such as Suetonius, but of his own record in the 'Monumentum Ancyranum'. He restored eighty-two temples in and near the city, and with them (as we must infer) the old cults that belonged to them. He revived the old sacrificial priesthoods, such as the *Flamen Dialis*, and the *Fratres Arvales*, whose records during the Empire have been found in great numbers on the site of their grove on the road to Ostia. By including himself among the members of other old religious colleges, the *Fetiales*, *Salii*, *Luperci*, and others, he secured both their revival and continuance; and in 12 B.C., on the death of Lepidus, he became *Pontifex maximus*, and thereby was legally enabled to supervise the rebuilding of the whole structure of the ancient religion. Even before that, in 17 B.C., he had celebrated the Secular games referred to above, with a wealth of detailed ritual of which we still have full accounts.

But this astute reformer contrived to combine with the old worship the idea of the Empire and of his own supremacy. Apollo was believed to be a god specially connected with the family of the Julii, and it was Apollo of Actium who had assisted him in the most critical moment of his fortunes. In 28 B.C. he therefore dedicated to Apollo Palatinus a splendid temple on a site which was his own personal property, thus founding a cult, which, beginning as a private concern of his own family, was destined, as he no doubt anticipated, to become one of the most important in Rome. Again, in his new Forum, N.E. of the Forum Romanum, he built a temple of Mars Ultor, the avenging deity of the murder of Julius, which he destined to supersede in some degree the great Capitoline temple of Jupiter; for here, instead of at the latter temple, the youths of the Imperial family were to assume their *toga virilis*; here the *triumphator* was to deposit his *insignia* after his triumph; and here, after each *lustrum*, the

Censors were to drive a nail into the wall. Lastly, a new temple of Vesta was built on the Palatine hill, directly connected with the house of the Imperial family; not superseding the old temple below, but showing none the less that the heart and life of the State were bound up with the hearth and home of the reigning Princes.

Augustus did not officially allow himself to be worshipped in his lifetime in Rome or Italy. But in Rome he placed the image of his Genius (the companion and inspiring spirit of each Roman during his life) between those of the two *Lares Compitales* at the meeting-points of streets throughout the city; and, in the chief city of each province, where the *concilium prouinciæ* met, he was worshipped in combination with Dea Roma. After his death he was officially deified, as Julius had been before him, and a guild was instituted, the *Sodales Augustales*, to take charge of his cult. Henceforward the worship of the Caesars becomes a leading fact in the history of the Empire; but, as it was in truth rather a political than a religious institution, and had its roots rather in the ideas and customs of the East than in any truly Roman conception of the divine nature, its further detail must be omitted here.

The following works may be consulted on the subject generally:—Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, ed. H. Jordan, 1883; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, Vol. III, ed. Wissowa, 1885; E. Aust, *Die Religion der Römer*, 1889; Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 1912<sup>2</sup>; Fowler, *The Roman Festivals of the Republic*, 1899, and *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 1911; J. B. Carter, *The Religion of Numa*, 1905. For the religion of the family the best work is an Italian one, *Il Culto Privato di Roma antica*, by A. De Marchi, 1896 and 1905. For religion under the Empire, Boissier, *La Religion Romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins*, 1874; Cumont, *Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain*, 1907. Many valuable articles will be found in Roscher's *Lexikon der Mythologie*, and in the new edition of Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*.

## B. CULTS IN OTHER ITALIAN COMMUNITIES.

213. It has already been said that Roman religious ideas and practices are, so far as we can tell, essentially the same as those of all the peoples of central Italy who belonged to the same race. It may, however, be as well to take a brief survey of what is known about the cults of some of the chief Latin and Italian cities.

Cults in other  
Italian com-  
munities.

In the neighbourhood of Rome, as at Rome itself, it is difficult to distinguish cults that are genuine Italian from those which had been early affected by Greek or Graeco-Etruscan influence. Thus at Falerii, the most prominent deity is Juno Curitis, a title which indicates an Italian origin, while in her cult we find a rite of doubtful origin (described in *Amores*, iii 13, by Ovid, whose wife came from Falerii). The ceremony seems to involve a 'sacred marriage',—a rite which we cannot trace for certain in Italian worship, and which may here be explained by the fact

that this city, when history begins, had long been under Etruscan rule, *i.e.* the Juno-cult, originally Italian, had been overlaid with Graeco-Etruscan ritual. It may be here remarked that, both in Latium and in southern Etruria, Juno seems to have been a favourite deity: we find her prominent at Veii as Regina, at Lanuvium as Sospita, and in the calendars of five Latin cities she gave her name to a month (Aricia, Tibur, Praeneste, Laurentum, Lanuvium).

214. The prominence of female deities in these parts of Italy, however it is to be explained, may lead us to dwell for a moment on the cults of two famous cities,—Praeneste on the hills looking down on the Campagna from the east, and Aricia in the woods under the Mons Albanus. The great deity of Praeneste was Fortuna, the vast enclosure of whose temple can still be traced. Here, again, we are forced to suspect the presence of foreign influence; and Praeneste, as has been proved by works of art found in its oldest tombs, was peculiarly open to this. Fortuna Primi-genia of Praeneste was in historical times believed to be the firstborn daughter of Jupiter; and another Fortuna here is declared by Cicero to have been worshipped by matrons as the mother both of Jupiter and Juno. But all this is far too anthropomorphic to be pure Italian, and probably arose from the superposition of Greek ideas on an original cult of Fortuna as a deity protecting women in childbirth, and able to foretell the fortunes of the children; for the temple of Fortuna Primi-genia was famous as the seat of a kind of oracle,—one of the very few in Italy,—where the future was ascertained by the casting of lots. The goddess, who also at Antium (on the coast a few miles distant) presided at an oracular cult of the same kind, was certainly no deity of mere luck, but rather a *numen* capable of furthering and bringing to a successful issue certain processes necessary to man, and especially that of childbirth.

215. Another Latin goddess believed to grant expectant mothers an easy delivery was the famous Diana Nemorensis of Aricia, who dwelt in the woods just above the deep-set lake of Nemi. This Diana of the woodland glades has led Dr Frazer to a series of researches so infinitely valuable to all anthropologists that we might well stay to offer sacrifice at her altar,—the ‘*pinguis et placabilis ara Dianae*’. But want of space forbids me to do more than tell, in Dr Frazer’s own words, the one peculiar feature of her cult. ‘The priest of the goddess bore the title of king, and his office was called a kingdom, but his tenure of the throne was a singular one. He was a runaway slave, who succeeded to office by slaying his predecessor, and he held it only so long as he could make good his title in single combat against all assailants. Any fugitive slave who contrived to break a branch from a certain tree in the grove had the right to fight the priest, and if he killed him he reigned in his stead. Naturally therefore the priest kept watch and ward over that tree’. The temple of this Diana was at one time the centre-point of a league of Latin cities, and the goddess eventually found her way to Rome as a consequence of this.

Passing out of Latium, we must not linger in Campania, where the presence of numerous Greek cities, and a long period of Etruscan domination, obscure whatever there may have been of pure Italian religion. In the central Oscan region, at Agnone near Bovianum in Samnium, we find an inscription of great interest, now in the British Museum, containing the names of several deities, some of which we can recognise as also Roman: e.g. Jupiter, Hercules, and Flora. The most striking point in the inscription is the occurrence of the word *kerriios* as an adjectival prefix to most of these deities (though not to Jupiter). This word in a slightly different form occurs also in Umbria as we shall see directly, and is found in the Roman Salian hymn (*duonus cerus*, applied to Janus), and on a very ancient vase (*ceri poculum*) and in the name Ceres; it is explained by scholars as connected with *create*, and meaning something of the same kind as *genius*, and seems to suggest that earliest stratum of Italian religious thought in which the *numina* are rather spirits than definitely conceived deities.

216. We may now turn northwards into Umbria, where at Gubbio (Iguvium) in the Apennines, not far from the ancient *uia Flaminia*, is still preserved the most famous and by far the most complete of all Italian religious inscriptions. The *tabulae Iguvinae* still present many points of difficulty to scholars, but of recent years their interpretation has been pushed far enough to enable us to make a short survey of their contents, which are of the utmost interest and value for all students of the old Italian religion. They were not all drawn up at the same time, and the character is partly Umbrian, partly Latin; the actual dates of writing are uncertain, but no part can be later than 100 B.C., and there are indications that they really belong to the period when the Etruscan power was still dominant. The nature of such religious documents suggests that they represent and stereotype cult-practices of a still older origin. They contain (1) detailed regulations for the lustration of the city and citadel of Iguvium, both in a shorter and older form, and in a fuller and later one; (2) regulations for the assembly of the *populus* of Iguvium, probably in connexion with the *lustratio*: this part is also in an older and later form; (3) a concluding sacrifice of the *lustrum* on behalf of a religious guild, the twelve *Fratres Atiedii*, who remind us of the twelve Roman *Fratres Aruales*, and seem to have been the leading priestly college at Iguvium; (4) an optional sacrifice to an infernal deity, which seems to stand by itself and is not connected with the *lustratio*; (5) directions for a half-yearly assembly of ten towns or clans of the district; (6) directions for sacrifice to certain deities in a particular month; and (7) two resolutions of the *Fratres Atiedii*, and directions for the supply of food for them. It will be seen at a glance that such documents must provide a large amount of material for the study of Italian religious ceremonies.

In studying them, with the help of Bücheler's Latin translation and



commentary, we are struck chiefly by two features. First, the ritual of the *lustratio* closely corresponds with all that we know of the same type of ceremony at Rome; a procession passes round the city with the victims, stopping at particular spots,—here the gates of the city,—*i.e.* its weakest points in a religious sense, where the series of sacrifices is performed with an elaboration of detail which is fairly astonishing, and with prayers of which the full text is given. Here we find, as at Rome, sacrifices both bloody and unbloody, the libation of wine and meal poured on the head of the victim, the same ‘silence’ during the prayer, the piacular sacrifice to atone for any unintentional omission, and the *instauratio*, or repetition of the whole process, if anything should have gone wrong. The victims are naturally the same as at Rome, but in the worship of the infernal deity (Hontus Iouius) a dog is sacrificed, as in the Roman rite of the *Robigalia*. Lastly, we have the same system of augury and of the inspection of entrails before they are laid upon the altar.

Secondly, we are struck by the names of the deities concerned, and by the complete absence of any indication of anthropomorphism. A few names are familiar to us,—Jupiter, Mars, Pomonus, Sancus; others are new and strange,—Vofionus, Hondus, Hula, Tursa. Jupiter seems to be the chief protector of the city, but with him are associated (apparently as guardians of the three separate gates) Mars and Vofionus, and all three have the curious cult-title Grabouius, of which the meaning is still uncertain. The *numen* of Jupiter seems to invade or qualify that of other deities, for we find a Tefrus Iouius, a Trebus Iouius, a Tursa Iouia, and a Hontus Iouius; also a Iupiter Sancus, and the latter epithet is again applied to Fisius or Fisouius, the deity of the ‘ocris Fisius’, or hill-citadel of Iguvium. The Italian idea of the functional character and appellation of deities is fully illustrated here, though we cannot always explain the functional epithets; we even find the processes of ritual personified as *numina*, *e.g.* Spector, the deity of the *spectio* of entrails. Lastly, the word Cerus, which we found in the inscription of Agnone, meets us again in the form Cerfus (adj. Cerfius); in the lustration of the people of Iguvium the chief deity concerned is Mars in the threefold form:—Cerfus Martius, Praestita Cerfia Cerfi Martii, Tursa Cerfia Cerfi Martii (‘Martia numina tria, siue triplicem Martem dicere fas est’: Bücheler). We cannot assume that these female names with male names in the genitive indicate a conjugal relation of male and female deities, though they may possibly throw some light on the origin of such anthropomorphic ideas. We are in fact here in the presence of a stratum of religious thought which seems to be peculiarly Italian, of which we have distinct traces in the old Roman worship, and which we must confess our inability to explain satisfactorily. I may conclude this brief account with words which Bücheler aptly quotes from Columella: ‘In uniuersa uita pretiosissimum est intelligere quemque nescire se quod nesciat’.

For Falerii, see Deecke, *die Falisker* (1888); for Praeneste, Fernique, *Étude sur Préneeste*, 1880; for Aricia, Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, and *Lectures on the early history of the Kingship*, ch. I; for the inscription of Agnone, Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, i 191 f, and for the Tabulae Iguinae, Bücheler, *Umbrica* (1883), Bréal, *Les Tables Eugubines* (1875), and Conway, *op. cit.* i 399 f.

## C. THE RELIGION OF THE ETRUSCANS.

217. In attempting an account of the religious ideas of the Etruscans, we are confronted at once by two great difficulties. First, the language of this mysterious people still remains unknown to us, and there is apparently no prospect of finding a key to it. Secondly, it is extremely difficult to distinguish that part of the religion of Etruria which was peculiar to the Etruscans proper, or 'Rasena', as they called themselves, from the native Italian cults and practices which they found in the country they occupied as conquerors. We know neither whence they came nor who they were; but we do know that they settled as conquerors in northern and central Italy, especially on the west coast, where, as a sea-faring people, they found a few harbours, and at one time pushed as far south as Campania; and no such conquering people in antiquity ever failed to retain and absorb, in a greater or less degree, the local worships of the conquered. To these two chief difficulties we may add another, viz. that the commercial and naval activity of this people brought them into contact with Greeks, Egyptians, Phenicians, from all of whom they adopted religious ideas, as well as the arts by which they gave expression to them. The religion of Etruria was in fact, like that of the later Romans, a medley; for this strange race seems to have been almost destitute of spiritual ideas of its own, but to have been singularly skilful in adopting and formalising the outward characteristics of those of others. And with all this skill in religious forms there went a certain brutality, which appears now and then in Latin literature and is confirmed by their own tomb-paintings. In Virgil's *Aeneid* but one man is 'contemptor diuom', the Etruscan chief Mezentius.

The religion  
of the  
Etruscans.

218. The least important part of the Etruscan religion was the worship of deities,—or, at any rate, it is that part about which we know least, and which was most obviously a medley. Their greatest god was Tinia or Tina, identified by the Romans with their Jupiter, whose cult was largely influenced from the time of the Tarquinian dynasty by the attributes of his neighbour. Tina was especially the wielder of the thunderbolt, though other deities shared the power with him; the thunder was his voice, he descended to earth in the lightning, and the study of these manifestations by the Etruscans became so highly elaborated that the god himself seems almost to have been lost in the science. He

Their deities.

was worshipped in every city in Etruria, but always in association with the two goddesses next to be mentioned, as also at Rome on the Capitol after the Etruscan kings had built his temple there. His two companions were (1) Cupra, or Juno as the Romans called her, and (2) Menerva; neither of these names can be shown to be Etruscan; they rather belong to the Italian dialects, and it is hard to say whether the deities they distinguish were purely Etruscan or not. These also were believed to wield thunderbolts, and, so far, we may look on them as Tuscanised, whatever their origin may have been. The Etruscan Juno is known to us in Latin literature by the story of her transference (by *evocatio*) from Veii to Rome after the capture of that city, where she was known as Regina, and by Ovid's charming description of her festival, a highly Graecised one, at Falerii. Menerva is specially associated with the art of playing wind-instruments, which the Romans learnt as it would seem from the Etruscans: in Etruscan art she is identified with Athene. Besides these three leading deities of the Etruscan cities, we know of several others, e.g. Vertumnus, a god connected with the fruits of the earth, and in Tuscan art represented by Dionysus, and Nortia of Volsinii, apparently a form of the Italian Fortuna; Neptunus, Volcanus, Veious and others are either simply Italian deities, or names used for Etruscan deities of whom we know nothing. In any case, in the present state of our knowledge, the so-called Etruscan deities are little more than names, and we need not dwell on them here. To the present writer the mythology of the Etruscans suggests rather an original monotheism, which has come strongly under the influence of polytheism in the course of their wanderings, and has itself become degraded, while the polytheism it has picked up has never been more than a veneer. Their beautiful mirrors and vases are works of art only, and indeed of Greek art, without any real religious significance, so far as we can discover. Only in their adornment of their tombs, which are really houses of the dead, do we see anything in the nature of a spiritual idea. The dead of high Etruscan families were placed in tombs decorated with the most elaborate paintings, never to be seen again by human eye. Scenes of every-day human life, of feasting, games, &c., alternate with others of the life in Hades, drawn largely from Greek mythology, and with a decided preference for the grim and grotesque, and for scenes of cruelty and bloodshed. Fortunately, the most persevering explorer of these tombs in the 19th century was an Englishman, George Dennis, from whose fascinating book the reader may gain a good idea of the habits of life and thought of this extraordinary people.

219. But by far the most curious feature of the Etruscan religion, and

Disciplina  
Etrusca.

that about which we are best informed, is the *disciplina Etrusca*, that extraordinary elaboration of the art of divination, which was the work of the priestly nobility of Etruria, was studied and in part adopted by Roman augurs, and lasted almost

throughout the period of the Roman empire. Though, in regard to its object, it was in close relation to the events and needs of human life, it may fairly be described as the most remarkable waste of human ingenuity known to history. Etruria was indeed, as a Christian Father said, *genetrix et mater superstitionis*.

The *disciplina* fell into three branches: (1) the art of foretelling the future from the examination of the entrails of victims; (2) the art of explaining the prophetic meaning of lightning and of averting its sinister effects; and (3) the art of interpreting *prodigia*, and of taking steps to avert their consequences. These arts were of course those practised at Rome, and (as we may assume) in Italy generally, but in Etruria they were elaborated to a degree unknown elsewhere, and were believed to have been communicated by a divine boy Tages, who was ploughed up at Tarquinii. The professionals who held the lore were called by the Romans *haruspices*; we know of them and their works chiefly from the *de Divinatione* of Cicero, whose friend A. Caecina of Volaterrae wrote a work on the subject, and from passages in Seneca and Pliny the elder. Only a very brief sketch of the *disciplina* can be given here.

(1) All victims slain at the altar were in the Italian ritual *consultatoria*, i.e. their internal organs were examined before being placed on the altar as the share of the god, to see whether they would be pleasing to him, and therefore propitious to the sacrificer. This process was developed by the Etruscans into a 'science'; every minute deviation from the normal condition of each organ was noted, and its meaning assigned. The liver was the object of the greatest solicitude, and we possess a bronze liver of normal form found at Piacenza, which may date from the third century B.C., and seems to be a curious connecting link between this science and that of augury. (2) The Etruscan doctrine of lightning was extraordinarily elaborate, and was the care of a special class or school of *haruspices*, the *fulguratores*. It consisted of four parts: the art of explaining the phenomenon, of expiating it, of averting it, and (strangest of all) that of drawing it down from heaven. The two last are very obscure, and may be omitted here. The art of observing and explaining lightning was based on the doctrine of the *templum* (see § 206), which was probably the common property of the Italian peoples, but was worked out by the Etruscan priests with characteristic elaboration. They believed the dwelling of the gods to be in the northern part of the sky, and the observer, taking his stand with his back to this and facing south, divided the heavens into four parts, each of them a square, and each of these again into four more. Nine gods had the power of sending lightning, Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Veiovis, Summanus, Volcanus, Saturnus, and Mars. Each of these had his own particular bolt, Jupiter alone (i.e. *Tinia*) having three; and the observer ascribed the lightning to a particular god chiefly by noting the division of the heaven from which it came, e.g. that which came from the first three divisions, those between north and east, was the work



of Jupiter. (The east, to the left of the observer, was the lucky quarter.) We have a detailed account of the *templum* and the location of the gods in its division by a late writer of the Empire, Martianus Capella. The other most important part of the *disciplina* was the expiation of lightning. Here, again, the practice was common to Italians, as indeed also to Greeks, but was specially elaborated by the Etruscans. The Romans, for example, regarded all places struck by lightning as sacred, and enclosed them with a fence which, from its resemblance to a well, took the name of *puteal* or 'well-cover' (also *bidental*, from the sacrifice of a two-year-old victim offered there). But the Etruscans developed this practice by making the spot itself into a *templum*; and, among other regulations of theirs, may be mentioned the singular one that, if a man were struck by lightning, his body was disposed of by inhumation, instead of being burnt. (3) Lastly, the *haruspices* were open to special consultation, like the Sibylline books, on the occasion of specially formidable *prodigia*; and we have records from various periods of Roman history of occasions when they were consulted by decree of the Senate, as to the gods to whom expiation was due, the meaning of the portent, or the manner of the expiation. Perhaps the most famous of these occasions was after the recall of Cicero in 57 B.C., when the question arose whether the site of his house on the Palatine, which had been made *sacrum*, could be restored to him.

It has often been remarked that the Etruscan people, at one time one of the most powerful in the Mediterranean, disappeared as a nation after the Roman conquest with astonishing suddenness. What has been said above about their religion may help to explain this; it suggests no sound principle of vitality, but rather a waste of energy and ingenuity.

The great work on the Etruscans is that of K. O. Müller, re-edited in 1877 by W. Deecke, with additions and alterations. Dennis's *Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria*, second edition (1883), is invaluable for the tomb-paintings. Deecke has produced five divisions of 'Etruscan researches', and also a monograph on the semi-Etruscan town Falerii. Shorter accounts of the religious doctrine of the people, especially in reference to their connexion with Rome, will be found in Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, iii 410 f; Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 469 f and elsewhere. See also Bouché-Leclercq, *Hist. de la Divination dans l'Antiquité*, iv 1 f. Quite recently a study of the gods of Martianus Capella and the bronze liver of Piacenza, by Carl Thulin (Giessen, 1906) has made the evidence from these sources more easily available. A short treatise *de Extipicio* by G. Blecher, 1905, may also be mentioned, as comparing the 'science of entrails' in Italy, Greece, and the East. See also W. von Bartel, *Die Etruskische Bronzleber von Piacenza*, 1910. The article 'Etrusker' by Körte and Skutsch in Pauly-Wissowa brings the subject up to date, without indicating any great advance in our knowledge.



## D. THE ROMAN CALENDAR.

220. The Roman method of reckoning time in the historical period of the Republic was a clumsy attempt to combine the solar year (365 days and rather less than a quarter) with the lunar year of 354 days; this was imperfectly done by a cycle of four years, two of which had 355 days, and the other two (the second and fourth) 377 and 378 respectively. This cycle contained about four more days than it should have done, and needed frequent correction by the Pontifices, who had sole charge of the Calendar. (On the correction of the Calendar, see §§ 118—122 *supra*.)

The Roman  
Calendar.

The year was at all times divided into twelve months. Under the old system the first month was Martius, named after Mars, who was specially associated with the operations of war and agriculture which begin in the spring: the three following, Aprilis, Maius, Junius, seem to indicate the opening, growth, and ripening of vegetation: the next six are simply numbered (Quintilis, Sextilis, September, October, November, December): and the last two are named, the one perhaps from the god Janus, and the last, the month of purification, from *februum*, a purifying instrument. The first, third, fifth, and eighth had 31 days, the rest 29. After Caesar's reform January became officially the first month, and was given 31 days, together with Sextilis (henceforward called August) and December, while to April, June, September, and November were allotted 30, February having 28 except in the fourth year of the cycle, when it had 29. (Cp. p. 94, § 110, and p. 100, § 121.)

The Roman month was divided according to the phases of the moon; the first appearance of the crescent marked the first day or *Kalendae*, which was sacred to Juno; on this day, according to ancient usage, the Pontifex announced whether the first quarter or *Nonae* (an uncertain event) would take place on the fifth or the seventh, while, in historical times, the Nones fell regularly on the seventh only in March, May, July, and October. The full moon, *Idus*, was always the eighth day after the first quarter, and was sacred to Jupiter (§ 111). These phases, real or imaginary, of the moon, were so firmly fixed in the Roman mind that all events, letters, &c., were dated with reference to them, the dater always looking forward to the next phase; e.g. the 2nd of April was in the Julian calendar the fourth day before the Nones (*ante diem quartum Non. Apr.*), the 30th of May was 'the second day before the Kalends of June'. There was also an old division into weeks of eight days each, the eighth of which (or according to Roman reckoning the ninth, *nundinae*) was a market day (§ 117).

The basis of the whole Calendar was the religious idea that all public operations, whether of religion proper, agriculture, war, or government,

should take place on days pleasing to the divine guardians of the city. We have no Calendar surviving from the pre-Julian period, but Mommsen has made it clear that we can discern in the post-Julian Calendars, of which we have fragments of thirty and one almost complete, the skeleton of the ancient so-called Calendar of Numa; a specimen subjoined will serve to show the religious nature of the whole.

## MENSIS FEBRUARIUS.

1.	N.	KAL.
2.	N.	
3.	N.	
4.	N.	
5.	NP.	NON.
6.	N.	
7.	N.	
8.	N.	
9.	N.	
10.	N.	
11.	N.	
12.	N.	
13.	NP.	EID.
14.	N.	
15.	NP.	LUPERCALIA.
16.	EN.	
17.	NP.	QUIRINALIA.
18.	C.	
19.	C.	
20.	C.	
21.	NP.	FERALIA.
22.	C.	
23.	NP.	TERMINALIA.
24.	N.	REGIFUGIUM.
25.	C.	
26.	EN.	
27.	NP.	EQUIRRIA.
28.	C.	

## MENSIS MARTIUS.

1.	NP.	KAL.
2.	F.	
3.	C.	
4.	C.	
5.	C.	
6.	C?	
7.	F.	NON.
8.	F.	
9.	C.	
10.	C.	
11.	C.	
12.	C.	
13.	EN.	
14.	NP.	EQUIRRIA.
15.	NP.	EID.
16.	F.	
17.	NP.	LIBERALIA.
18.	C.	
19.	NP.	QUINQUATRUS.
20.	C.	
21.	C.	
22.	N.	
23.	NP.	TUBILUSTRIUM.
24.	QRCE.	
25.	C.	
26.	C.	
27.	F.	
28.	C.	
29.	C.	
30.	C.	
31.	C.	

In the Calendar for these two months the first thing which will strike the reader is the occurrence of ten great festivals, marked in large letters; these undoubtedly formed part of the earliest Roman religious year. All but two are on days of uneven number, *i.e.* lucky ones; the exceptions, *i.e.* the Regifugium, Feb. 24, and the Equirria, March 14, have no parallel in the whole calendar of the year, and have never been conclusively explained. Besides these festivals we find Kalends, Nones and Ides; of these the Ides were technically festivals of Jupiter (*feriae Ioui*), while the Kalends were sacred to Juno but not festivals. Lastly we note that each day has a mark attached to it in the form of a letter or letters, all of which have a religious signification. In February, which was a time of purification, one of the most common letter-marks is not to be found, viz. F, *i.e.*

*fastus* or *fas*, which meant that civil and especially judicial business might be transacted on the day so marked. February was in fact, according to old Roman ideas, a time of ill omen, and the cult of the dead fell in it; the commonest letter is, as we should expect, N, *i.e. nefastus*, indicating that the day was not proper for civil business, but at the end of the month, when the rites of the Parentalia ('Feralia' in the *Fasti*) were over, we find six days marked C, *i.e. Comitialis*, days on which the Comitia might meet. All the festivals of the month, and in fact all the festivals of the year except the Lemuria in May and the Vestalia in June, are marked NP, of which the exact meaning has never been discovered, and was not known to the Romans of the literary age. One day of February, the 16th, is marked EN, *i.e. endotercisus* or *intercisus*, 'cut into two parts'; the morning and evening were *nefastus*, but in the middle of the day, between the slaying of a victim and the placing of the entrails on the altar, it was *fastus*. This mark occurs only eight times in the year, and always on the eve of some festival; but its exact religious significance is unknown. In the calendar for March, which was a month of a much brighter and happier character, and the beginning of both agricultural and military activity after the winter, we find only one day marked N; *i.e.* this day, the 22nd, was the only one in the whole month on which civil business was altogether illegal. As the dead had to be attended to in February, so in March the living citizens and all their interests and activities called for constant care. There is a good example of this to be noticed on the 24th, which is marked QRCF. *i.e.* 'Quando rex comitiauit fas'. This was one of two days in the year (the other was May 24) when the Comitia curiata met for the sanctioning of wills; and no other civil business might be transacted until this meeting of the Comitia, which had a strictly religious character, had been brought to an end by the Rex.

These remarks will serve to show how strictly the public life of the old Roman was regulated for him in the months of February and March; and by going through the other months of the Calendar in the same way, the student may get in outline some idea of the daily life as well as the religious practice of the Roman people in the early stages of its history. After the Julian reform the Calendar became more and more a record of the important events in the history of the Caesars and their families, and chiefly served to remind the plebs of the ever-increasing number of their holidays and games. The names of the old festivals remained, but, with a few exceptions, they gradually fell into oblivion, and even in the time of Cicero and Varro many of them had lost all meaning. In one month, July, out of five festivals marked in the Calendars, not one admits of an easy or satisfactory explanation.

Subjoined is a conspectus of all the religious festivals of the year, with their dates and the names of the deities concerned, so far as these are known to us. The order of the months is that of the old Roman year, beginning with March and ending with February.

DATE	FESTIVAL	DEITY	DATE	FESTIVAL	DEITY
Mart. 14	Equirria	Mars.	Sept.	No festivals; but the Ides (13th) was the day of the Epulum Iouis.	
" 17	Liberalia	Liber.			
" 19	Quinquatrus	Mars, later Minerva.	Oct. 11	Meditrinalia	Unknown.
" 23	Tubilustrium	Mars.	" 13	Fontinalia	Fons?
			" 19	Armilustrium	Mars.
April 15	Fordicidia	Tellus.	Nov.	No festivals.	
" 19	Cerialia	Ceres.			
" 21	Parilia	Pales.	Dec. 11	Agonia	Unknown.
" 23	Vinalia	Iuppiter.	" 15	Consualia	Consus.
" 25	Robigalia	Robigus.	" 17	Saturnalia	Saturnus.
			" 19	Opalia	Ops.
Maius			" 21	Dualia	Angerona?
9-11-13	Lemuria	Manes.	" 23	Larentalia	Larenta?
" 21	Agonium	Vedious?			
" 23	Tubilustrium	Mars, later Vulcanus.	Jan. 9	Agonia	Ianus?
			" 11-15	Carmentalia	Carmenta.
Junius 9	Vestalia	Vesta.	Feb. 15	Lupercalia	Faunus?
" 11	Matralia	Mater Matuta.	" 17	Quirinalia	Quirinus.
			" 21	Feralia	Di parentum.
Quinct. 5	Poplifugia	Unknown.	" 23	Terminalia	Terminus.
" 19-21	Lucaria	Unknown.	" 24	Regifugium	Unknown.
" 23	Neptunalia	Neptunus.	" 27	Equirria	Mars.
" 25	Furrinalia	Furrina.			
Sext. 17	Portunalia	Portunus.			
" 19	Vinalia rustica	Iuppiter.			
" 21	Consualia	Consus.			
" 23	Volcanalia	Volcanus.			
" 25	Opiconsivia	Ops			
		Consiva.			
" 27	Volturnalia	Volturnus.			


The surviving fragments of Calendars will be found in the first volume of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*, second edition, p. 283 f, with full commentary by Mommsen, whose *Römische Chronologie* (ed. 2, 1859) is also indispensable. See also Fowler, *Roman Festivals of the period of the Republic* (1899), passim; Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, p. 365 f; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* (ed. Wissowa), III 281 f, and C. Jullian, in Daremberg-Saglio, *Dict. des Antiquités*; also Wissowa on *Fasti* (1903) in the new édition of Pauly's *Real-Encyclopädie*.



## V. PRIVATE ANTIQUITIES.

### V. 1. A TABLE OF THE RELATIONSHIPS OF A MAN.

§ 221.



(1) (a) and (b) are *fratres patruales*; (c) and (d) are *fratres consobrini*; (a) and (c) are *fratres amitini*; (e) and (f) are *sobrini*; (a) is *propior sobrino* to (f).

(2) Degrees of relationship between collaterals are reckoned by counting upwards from the one person to the common ancestor, and thence downwards to the second, each generation either way counting as a degree. Thus the VIR above is related to his *avunculus* in the third degree; (e) and (f) are related in the sixth degree. In the direct line the degrees correspond to the number of generations.

(3) *Cognati* are those who are descended from a legally married pair. In the law of inheritance only *cognati* up to the sixth degree were considered.

(4) *Adfines* are connexions by marriage, viz. the husband and his wife's *cognati* on the one hand, the wife and her husband's *cognati* on the other. Besides the terms given in the above table the following may be mentioned : *socer* (father-in-law), *socrus* (mother-in-law), *pruignus* and *pruigna* (step-son and step-daughter), *uetricus* (step-father), *nouerca* (step-mother), *lenir* (husband's brother), *glos* (husband's sister).

(5) The chief ancient authorities are : Justinian, *Inst.* iii 6 ; *Dig.* xxxviii 10, 10.

## V. 2. ROMAN NAMES.

222. In patrician or noble families under the Republic a man usually bore three names, called respectively *praenomen*, *nomen*, and *cognomen*; *Q(uitus) Fabius Maximus* may be taken as typical.

Men.

Of these names the *nomen*, ending in *-ius*, was the most important, as it indicated the *gens* or house to which the person belonged. The *praenomen* was the personal, or, as we should put it, the 'Christian' name, given on the *dies lustricus* (see below, § 225). The number of *praenomina* in use among noble families was, up to the time of Sulla, very limited. These earlier *praenomina* were abbreviated, e.g. C. for *Gaius*, Sp. for *Spurius*, Sex. for *Sextus*, etc., while the new or revived names adopted from Sulla's time were written in full, e.g. *Faustus*, *Cossus*, etc. The *cognomen* was generally used in noble families under the Republic, less frequently in plebeian. In origin it was evidently later than the other two names, and does not appear in official documents till the age of Sulla. It is found, however, on coins from the time of the Second Punic war. The *cognomen* marked the family branch to which the individual belonged, though it has been justly remarked that such *cognomina* as *Barbatus*, *Longus*, *Capito*, *Naso*, etc., were evidently derived from some personal rather than family peculiarity. As the branches of a family became numerous, additional *cognomina* were used to distinguish between them, and sometimes we find as many as three in all, as in the case of *P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum*. When a *cognomen* was given by way of honour, e.g. *Africanus*, *Macedonicus*, *Creticus*, etc., it descended to the eldest son, but then seems to have died out. In formal and official style, the father's, grandfather's, and great-grandfather's names and that of the individual's tribe were given, e.g. *M. Tullius M. f. M. n. M. pr(onepos) Cor(nelia tribu) Cicero*.

Roman women were (in a legal sense) originally without name. In early times they added the name of their father or husband

Women.

in the genitive after their own, at first without, later with, *filia*. Towards the end of the Republic the gentile name is often used alone, e.g. *Iulia*, *Tullia*, etc. A *praenomen* is frequently found, a *cognomen* practically never. In Imperial times women generally bore two names, either the *nomen* and *cognomen* of the father (e.g. *Aemilia Lepida*) or the combined names of the father and mother. Often a derivative in *-ina*, *-illa*, or *-ulla* was employed, such as *Agrippina*, *Liulla*, *Fabulla*.

223. By adoption the person adopted passed out of his own *gens* and entered that of his adopter. Accordingly, he assumed all

Change of name through adoption.

the names of the latter, adding as *cognomen* the name of his original *gens*, altered by the addition of the suffix *-anus*. A familiar example is that of the son of *L. Aemilius Paulus* adopted by *P. Cornelius Scipio*: he became *P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus*. From Sulla's time deviations from this rule begin to occur. Thus *M.*

*Pomponius Atticus*, when adopted by his uncle *Q. Caecilius*, was named *Q. Caecilius Pomponianus Atticus*, thus retaining his original *cognomen*. The case of the younger Pliny shows a further deviation. His first name was *P. Caecilius L. f. Secundus*. On his testamentary adoption by his uncle *C. Plinius Secundus* he was called *C. Plinius L. f. Caecilius Secundus*. Not only did he thus retain his own gentile name (without alteration) as a *cognomen*, but he also called himself the son of his real and not of his adoptive father (*Lucii filius*, not *Gaii filius*). This was contrary to all Republican precedent. The truth is that under the Empire the importance of the family declined, with the result that the old system of nomenclature came to be disregarded. Later on under the Empire the heir simply added the names of his adoptive father to his own.

224. In the early period slaves were generally called by a name ending in *-por*, such as *Marcipor*, *Lucipor*, *Quintipor*. These were abbreviations for *Marci puer*, etc. Later on a fuller form came into vogue, e.g. *Nicomachus Albi*, *Marci servus*; this is the name of the slave together with his master's *nomen* and *praenomen* in the genitive. Slaves.

The earliest custom was for the manumitted slave (*libertinus*) to take his master's *nomen*, at the same time choosing a *praenomen* at will and retaining his original name as *cognomen*. Thus the poet *L. Livius Andronicus* was the freedman of *M. Livius Salinator*. From about 50 B.C., however, freedmen took both *praenomen* and *nomen* from their master. *M. Tullius Tiro*, Cicero's freedman secretary, will serve as an instance. Freedmen of a woman took the *nomen* and *praenomen* of the father of their *patrona*, e.g. *M. Livius, Augustae libertus, Ismarus*. Freedmen.

Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Nomen*; Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, i 1—68; *id.* in *Hermes*, iii 62—77 (with especial reference to the adoption of the younger Pliny); Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben der Römer*, 7—27; Pauly and Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, s.v. *Cognomen*; Oxé in *Rhein. Mus.*, lix (1904), 108 ff (for names of slaves); and Egbert, *Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions* (revised ed. 1908), 82—113; also W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, 646 pp., 1904 (mainly linguistic). Bibliography.

A general reference may here be given to the most recent books on the subjects dealt with in this chapter, viz. H. W. Johnston, *The Private Life of the Romans*, Chicago, 1905, W. Warde Fowler's *Social Life in the Age of Cicero*, 1908, the *Guide* to the newly arranged 'Room of Greek and Roman Life' in the British Museum, 1908, and H. Blümner, *Die römischen Privataltertümer* (Müller's *Handbuch*, iv 2, 2<sup>3</sup>), 1911.

### V. 3. BIRTH, MARRIAGE, AND DEATH.

225. MIDWIVES (*obstetrices*) are occasionally mentioned in Latin literature and inscriptions. They appear as a rule to have been freedwomen. We find a Valeria Berecunda at Rome claiming to be the best midwife of her district. Immediately after birth, the infant was washed. This is depicted on a design found painted (as it is said) on the ceiling of the *Thermae* of Trajan at Rome. The newly-born child has Birth.

just been washed, and a man, probably the father, runs forward to lift it up. In this we may probably recognise that symbolic act whereby the father signified his intention of rearing his offspring (*tollere* or *suscipere liberos*). Exposure of female or deformed infants was not uncommon, hence the existence of a special goddess *Lēuāna*, whose function it was to prompt this act of raising from the ground. Besides this goddess there were numerous shadowy deities destined to watch over the child's early days—the *dea Rumina*, *Potina*, *Edūca*, *Ossipāgo* and the *diuus Statānus*, *Fabulinus*, *Farinus*, *Locutius*—deities whose different spheres of operation are sufficiently indicated by their names. On the ninth day after birth (or on the eighth, in the case of a girl) the child was solemnly purified (*dies lustricus*), and received, in all probability, its *praenomen*. At this ceremony the goddess *Nundina* was supposed to preside. Presents in the form of small metal figures, often representing implements, such as axes, sickles, swords, etc., were made by the parents, relations, and household slaves. These figures were strung together into a kind of necklace for the child. They were called *crepundia*, and were believed to possess the power of averting the evil eye. As we learn from the comic poets, lost or exposed children were frequently identified by means of these *crepundia*. On the day of lustration the *bullā*, or circular capsule containing an amulet, was also suspended from the neck of the freeborn child. This capsule was made of gold, if the parents were well off; of bronze or leather, if poor. It was worn by boys till their assumption of the *toga virilis* (at 14–17 years of age), by girls probably till marriage. Up to the time of M. Aurelius there seems to have been no system of birth registration at Rome. Aurelius ordered that registration should be made by the father within thirty days of birth, at Rome with the *praefectus aerarii*, in the provinces with the *tabularii publici*.

Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 82 ff; Becker and Göll, *Gallus*, ii 64 ff;  
 Bibliography. Daremberg et Saglio, *Dict. des Ant.*, s.v. *Bulla*, *Crepundia*;  
 Pauly and Wissowa, s.v. *Bulla*, *Crepundia*; Schreiber and  
 Anderson, *Atlas of Class. Ant.*, pl. lxxxii, fig. 3; Blummer, *Privatalt.* 299 f.

**226.** There were several special forms of Roman marriage. A broad line can be drawn between (1) marriage bringing the wife into the *manus* or absolute power of her husband, and (2) marriage *sine in manum conuentione*. The latter can be dismissed very briefly. It was brought about by mere consent on the part of the husband and wife, and did not involve any special rites or ceremonies. It was rare in the early history of Rome, but became increasingly common as time went on. Marriage which brought the wife into the *manus* of her husband, i.e. put her into the position of a daughter to him, could be effected in one of three ways—by *confarreatio*, by *coemptio*, or by *usus*. The confarreate marriage was confined to patricians, and was essentially a religious ceremony. It was performed in the presence of the *Pontifex Maximus*,



the *Flamen Dialis*, and ten witnesses, and derived its name from the *panis farreus*, or cake of spelt, either eaten or offered at the marriage. Another feature of the ceremony was that the bride and bridegroom had to sit side by side upon two stools covered with a sheepskin. Marriage by *coemptio* was probably at first a plebeian ceremony. The essential part of it was the figurative selling of the bride to her husband (and possibly of the husband to the bride) in the presence of a scale-holder (*libripens*) and five witnesses. Marriage by *usus* was accomplished by a year's uninterrupted cohabitation. If the wife absented herself for three nights in the year, this was sufficient to deprive the husband of his *manus* over her.

But apart from these special forms there were certain rites common (though not essential) to all modes of marriage. They may be described under four main heads, viz. (1) Betrothal; (2) Preliminary preparations; (3) The wedding ceremony; (4) The escorting of the bride to the house of the bridegroom.

(1) Betrothal (*sponsalia*) was negotiated by the respective fathers or guardians, unless the man was independent (*sui iuris*). To the question *spondesne?* the father of the woman, if he approved the match, answered *spondeo*. The man then gave his fiancée a pledge (*arra*), which generally took the form of a ring. Fig. 1 is an example of a gold betrothal-ring of about the third century A.D. The clasped hands are expressive of the plighted troth. Ordinarily, betrothal by consent could be dissolved at will by either side (*repudium renuntiare* or *remittere*). In late Imperial times, however, betrothal became a more serious matter; written contracts were introduced, a feast was given, and presents were made to the fiancée.




Fig. 1. Gold betrothal-ring in the British Museum.

(2) Certain days and seasons of the year were avoided as unfavourable for marriage. Such were March, May (the month which saw the purificatory ceremonies of the *Lemuria* and the *Argei*), and the first half of June, as well as all the Kalends, Nones, and Ides, with the days succeeding them. On the day before the wedding, the bride laid aside her *toga praetexta*, and dedicated it with her toys to the *Lares* of her father's house. Her bridal dress consisted of a *tunica recta*—a robe woven vertically after the ancient fashion and girt with a woollen girdle (*cingulum*), a veil of flame-colour (*flammeum*), and saffron-coloured shoes (*socci lutei*). Her hair was divided into six locks (*sex crines*) by a spear-shaped comb known as the *hasta*

*caelibaris*. Beneath her veil she wore a chaplet of flowers plucked by her own hands.

(3) On the wedding morning the auspices were taken and the wedding contract (*tabulae nuptiales*) was signed. The next step was the bringing together of the bride and bridegroom by the *pronūba* or matron-friend of the bride, and the solemn clasping of hands (*dextrarum iunctio*). This is a scene frequently represented on Roman *sarcophagi*, where the *pronūba* places a hand on the shoulder of each, and the man grasps in his left hand a scroll, perhaps the wedding contract. A prayer was then offered by the *auspex nuptiarum* to Jupiter, Juno, Venus, Diana, and Fides, and the prayer was followed by a sacrifice in honour of Jupiter. This latter ceremony is shown in the illustration (Fig. 2). The bridegroom is seen pouring a libation over a fire burning upon a tripod. Opposite him stands the bride, and behind the pair is Juno Pronūba. On the left are seen Venus and Cupid, Hymenaeus with the torch, and the three Graces; on the right are Victory, a boy with flowers, a *camillus*, and two attendants with the ox ready for sacrifice. The ceremony ended with the expression of good wishes (*feliciter!*) on the part of the guests, who partook of a banquet (*cena*) in the house of the bride's father.



Fig. 2. Marriage sacrifice. From a relief on a sarcophagus at St Petersburg (*Monumenti dell' Istituto*, iv pl. 9).

(4) At nightfall came the escorting (*deductio*) of the bride from her father's to the bridegroom's house. The most graphic description of this procession is given in the famous epithalamium of Catullus in honour of Manlius and Vinia. The bride was symbolically torn from her mother's arms, a reminiscence of rude and violent times. The procession was headed by torch-bearers and flute-players, and was generally accompanied by a considerable crowd of people, among whom the boys were particularly prominent, chanting Fescennine verses and importuning the bridegroom for nuts, the last-named probably an omen of fertility. The bride was attended by three boys, whose fathers and mothers were still living. One preceded her, carrying a torch of white-thorn (*spina alba*), the

other two walked one on either side of her. She herself carried three coins (*asses*), destined one for the bridegroom, another for the *Lares familiares* (the deities of her new home), and a third for the *Lares compitales* (the deities of the nearest crossways). When she reached the bridegroom's house, she anointed the door-posts and decked them with fillets, both acts symbolic of dedication to a god. To avoid the ill-omen of stumbling, she was carefully lifted over the threshold, after she had uttered the simple but significant expression of devotion to her husband: *ubi tu Gaius, ego Gaia*. The bridegroom received the bride with a present of the elements indispensable to the mistress of a house, viz. fire and water. On the day following, the bride sacrificed at her husband's altar, and in the evening a banquet known as *repotia* took place.

Muirhead, *Historical Intr. to the Private law of Rome*<sup>2</sup>; Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Matrimonium*; Rossbach, *Untersuchungen über die römische Ehe*, and *Röm. Hochzeits- und Ehedenkmal*; Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 28 ff; Becker and Göll, *Gallus*, ii 12 ff; Samter, *Familienfeste der Griechen u. Römer*; Baumeister, *Denkmal*, s.v. *Hochzeit*; Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Matrimonium*; Pauly and Wissowa, s.v. *Coemptio, Confarreatio*; for illustrations, see *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, 1888, pl. 9; A. H. Smith, *Cat. of Sculpture in Brit. Mus.*, iii, No. 2307; *Röm. Mitt.*, iv, pl. 4, 89 ff. (*coemptio* scene from early Etruscan monument). Blümner, *Privatalt.* 341 ff.

Bibliography.

227. We are told that the Romans laid their dying (hence called *depositi*) upon the ground, probably that they might die in contact with that earth, beneath which they were soon to pass.

Death and burial.

At the moment of death it was the custom for the nearest relative to catch, as it were, with his lips the last breath of the dying. Those who stood around the bed raised a loud cry (*conclamatio*), originally perhaps with some idea of calling back the departing spirit. The eyes of the dead were closed by the nearest relation. The death-scene is found sculptured on *sarcophagi*, where the father, mother, and other members of the family are grouped round the bed in attitudes of grief. The body was next taken and washed with warm water. Application was then made to the *libitinarii*, professional undertakers, who were to be found at the temple of *Venus Libitina*. These supplied slaves called *pollinctores*, whose duty it was to carry out the various details connected with the preparation of the corpse for burial. The deceased was fully dressed either in the *toga* or in the special garments becoming his rank in life, and was laid out in the *atrium* of the house on a couch (*lectus funebris*) with his feet turned towards the door. This ceremony was called *collocatio*. Crowns were placed on the heads of persons who had earned this distinction, a custom evidenced by the gold crowns, imitating oak, laurel, and other leaves, which are so often discovered in tombs. The above-mentioned rites are well illustrated by a relief (Fig. 3) found near Rome on the *via Labicana*, and probably belonging to the family monuments of the Haterii. The deceased, a woman, is seen lying fully clothed on a lofty bed placed in

the *atrium* of a house. At the corners of the bed four large torches are burning. A man, perhaps the *pollinctor*, is in the act of placing a garland upon the head of the corpse; on his right stand two hired mourning women (*præficiae*). Below, the family of the dead walk in sad procession. In the three figures at the head of the bed we may possibly recognise three female slaves who wear the pointed cap called *pilleus* in token of their liberation by the dead woman's will. The rule that the newly freed slave should have his head shaved, may very likely not have applied to women. A coin was frequently placed in the mouth of the corpse as a kind of passage-money to the other world, a custom which is attested by discoveries made in Roman tombs. Before the house a branch of pine or cypress was set, mainly to warn the passer-by against ceremonial pollution.



Fig. 3. Lying in state. From a relief in the Lateran Museum, Rome (*Monumenti dell' Istituto*, v pl. 6).

The Romans made a distinction between an ordinary funeral (*funus translativum*) and a public funeral of a distinguished person (*funus indictivum*); to the latter the people were invited by a public crier (*præco*) in a set form of words: *ollus Quiris leto datus; exequias ire quibus est*



*commodum, iam tempus; ollus ex aedibus effertur.* The following is a general description of a Roman funeral procession; details of course varied according to the rank and wealth of the deceased.

In early times funerals took place by night, but subsequently this custom was restricted to the cases of poor persons (whose relations could not afford to make the usual display) and young children (*acerba funera*). A survival of the original custom is, however, to be found in the practice of carrying lighted torches, even when the funeral took place by day. The funeral of an important personage was marshalled by a *designator*. The illustration (Fig. 4) shows the funeral procession of some provincial magnate of about the Augustan period, as depicted on a sculptured stone relief. At the head are four *tibicines*, two *cornicines*, and a *liticen*, ranged in two files; then come two hired mourners (*præficiae*), who are probably singing dirges (*naeniae*). Next follows a litter borne by eight men and apparently steadied by the *designator*. On it rests the funeral-bed, backed by an elaborate screen; upon the bed is laid the deceased person, reclining in the attitude of one still living. The litter is followed by several members of the family. We can well understand from this scene Horace's allusion to the noisiness of Roman funerals. Other occasional features besides those mentioned were the presence of a *minus* or mummer, imitating the gestures of the dead, and of a train of men wearing the *imagines* or portrait-masks of his ancestors. The goal of the procession was the *forum*, where, in the case of distinguished persons, a panegyric (*laudatio*) was pronounced. After leaving the *forum* the funeral procession wended its way to the place of burning (*ustrina*), which in historical times was always outside the city-walls. The body was placed on a pyre (*rogus*), and a light was applied by one of the relations with averted face. The ashes, after being cooled with water or wine, were collected by the nearest relatives and placed in an urn (*olla* or *urna*). On the day of the funeral a purificatory feast (*fēriae dēnīcales*) was held in the house of the deceased, and another banquet (*stīlīcernium*) took place at the tomb itself. A period of nine days' mourning followed, terminating in an offering of food (*sacrificium novemdiale*) at the tomb. Every year offerings of water, wine, milk, oil, etc. were made by members of the family on the anniversary of the day of death, and the tomb was decked with flowers.

Inhumation preponderated at Rome up to the sixth century B.C. In the XII Tables (450 B.C.) both inhumation and cremation are recognised, but thenceforward the latter was almost universally adopted, except in the case of certain families, notably the Corneliī. Infants also were buried unburnt. A reminiscence of early times, when inhumation was the universal practice, is to be found in the custom of cutting off a finger from the corpse (*ōs resectum*) and giving it solemn burial in earth. The practice of cremation went out under the influence of Christianity. By the time of the Antonines, burial in *sarcophagi* had become very common.




Fig. 4. Funeral procession. Stone relief found at Preturo in 1879, and now preserved at Aquila degli Abruzzi. From a photograph presented by the Marchese Persichetti, Government Inspector of Antiquities for the district: *about one tenth of real size.*

228. The tombs were ranged on either side of the roads leading from the towns. The illustration (Fig. 5) shows those outside the Herculaneum Gate at Pompeii. The forms of the monuments are very varied. The altar-type raised on a large stone foundation

Monuments.



Fig. 5. Street of the tombs at Pompeii: reproduced (by permission) from pl. ix in Mau's *Pompeii in Leben und Kunst*, Engelmann, Leipzig, 1900.

is very frequent; other tombs take the form of a columned shrine, others of a vaulted niche. Most of them have an accessible chamber at their base, where the urns were set, and where the relatives could place their offerings. Sometimes, however, a pipe led down directly from the upper surface to the urn, so that libations could be poured down from above. The monuments by the roadside must have been those of the comparatively well-to-do. At Rome the poor were buried in pits (*pūtīcūli*) in a public cemetery on the Esquiline, at Pompeii they were buried at the foot of the town-wall, their names in many instances being inscribed on the wall itself. Persons of moderate means resorted to the plan of raising a joint tomb by means of subscriptions. They formed themselves into clubs (*collegia*), and erected the sepulchral chambers known as *columbaria*. These are found in all directions round Rome, situated for the most part (like the ordinary



tombs) by the side of one of the great roads. *Columbaria* are in the form of large rectangular chambers, partly above, and partly below ground. Their walls are honeycombed with niches, rising in tier after tier. In these niches were deposited the urns containing the ashes of the dead. A noted example was the *columbarium* built for the slaves and freedmen of Livia, wife of Augustus, which was capable of holding at least 3000 urns. This was in very perfect condition at the time of its discovery near the *porta Appia* in 1726<sup>1</sup>, but it has now perished. In the fork between the *via Appia* and the *via Latina* there are, however, several well-preserved *columbaria*, the finest being that of the freedmen of Octavia, wife of Nero.

Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Funus*; Kirchmann, *de funeribus Romanorum*, Hamburgi, 1605 (for Latin literature on the subject); Pauly and Bibliography. Wissowa, and Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, s.v. *Bestattung*; Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 340 ff; Becker and Göll, *Gallus*, iii 481 ff; Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Funus*; I. Müller, *Handbuch der klass. Altertumswiss.*, iv<sup>2</sup> 318 ff; Samter, *Zu römischen Bestattungsbräuchen* (in the *Hirschfeld Festschrift*, 249 ff); for monuments, see Altmann, *Die röm. Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit*; Mau and Kelsey, *Pompeii*, ch. XLIX and L; Pauly and Wissowa, Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Columbarium*; Baumeister, s.v. *Gräber*; for illustrations cp. Schreiber and Anderson, *Atlas of Class. Ant.*, pls. xcix, c; A. H. Smith, *Cat. of Sculpture in Brit. Mus.*, iii, No. 2315. See also Blümner, *Privatalt.* 474 ff.

## V. 4. THE POSITION OF WOMEN.

### A. UNDER THE REPUBLIC.

229. 'OUR forefathers', wrote Livy<sup>2</sup>, 'willed that women should not undertake even private business without the authority of a guardian, that they should be in the power (*manus*) of their parents, brothers, or husbands'. This accurately represents the legal position of women in the earlier period of Roman history. The law placed the woman under perpetual tutelage, and even the death of her father gave the unmarried woman no independence. She passed straightway from the *manus* of her father to that of her nearest male relatives (*agnāti*). The real object of this stringent guardianship seems to have been to keep the woman from disposing of the family property at will.

Yet in spite of these apparently severe legal restrictions Roman women enjoyed an amount of freedom which their Greek sisters might have envied. The very fact that Roman girls were not infrequently educated with boys<sup>3</sup> shows that there was no tendency to keep women in an Oriental seclusion. The married Roman lady carried on her daily occupations in the *atrium*, or main room of the house, which was readily accessible from without; she was never confined

Legal  
position.

Actual  
position.

<sup>1</sup> Daremberg et Saglio, fig. 1741.

<sup>3</sup> See, however, § 285.

<sup>2</sup> xxxiv 2, 11.



like a Greek woman to a special *γυναικεῖον*. Her position in the house was marked by the honourable title of *domina* with which she was addressed. She took her meals with her husband, who in the earliest period sat with her. Later on, however, it became the custom for him to recline, while she and the children sat. Her occupations were simple, being confined mainly to the upbringing of the children and the superintendence of household work; she was also specially concerned with the preparation of wool for the weaving of the family garments. The ideal woman of the Republic may be summed up in the words of a celebrated inscription: 'She loved her husband with her whole heart, she bare two sons...; cheerful in converse, dignified in mien, she kept the house, she made wool<sup>1</sup>'. This last is no anticlimax. There is no more frequent term of commendation on the tombstones than the simple *lānifica*. It is the old Biblical ideal of the virtuous woman: 'she seeketh wool and flax and worketh willingly with her hands. She layeth her hands to the spindle, and her hands hold the distaff'.

230. But though this ideal never really died out under the Republic, there was a continuous advance in the direction of the emancipation of women. The beginnings date from about the time of the Second Punic war. The development did not at first take the form of increased social liberties. Women at Rome seem at all times to have been able to go out in public, when occasion arose, e.g. to attend religious festivals, funerals, or banquets. The acquisition of property and the right to dispose of it were the objects most desired. While the Second Punic war was raging, the *Lex Oppia* had been passed to limit the wearing of jewels and gay garments, as well as the use of carriages, by women. In 195 B.C. it was repealed. Women began to get property into their own hands, employing the aid of legal fictions in order to evade the authority of their guardians. Hence the passing of the *Lex Voconia* in 169 B.C., with the object of preventing women from inheriting property from the richest class of citizens. The spread of Greek culture also tended to relax the strict views which had prevailed as to the sacredness of the marriage tie and of family life. On the other hand, the mental horizon of women was broadened, and we meet with the best type of cultured women in Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, and Cornelia, the wife of Pompeius Magnus. A disquieting feature of the latter part of this period is the devotion of women to new cults of Eastern origin, a devotion which resulted in 186 B.C. in the scandal of the *Bacchanalia*. The worship of Cybele and Isis (the latter from the time of Sulla) had also injurious effects.

Historical  
development.

The results of these various influences are only too plainly visible at the end of the Republic. The marriage tie is frankly disregarded. The flimsiest pretexts suffice to bring about a divorce. Sulla and Pompeius Magnus each married five

Position at  
the end of the  
Republic.

<sup>1</sup> C.I.L. i 1007; Dessau, ii p. 930; Mommsen, *History of Rome*, i 74, E.T. ed. 1894.

wives, Julius Caesar and M. Antonius four. But perhaps the most striking evidence on this point is to be found in the funeral panegyric possibly delivered by Q. Lucretius Vespillo the consul of 19 B.C. 'So long a married life as ours', he says, 'ended by death and not by divorce, is rare; it has been our lot to have it prolonged for forty-one years without a quarrel'. Political considerations might perhaps be pleaded in the case of a Sulla or a Caesar; nothing but the existence of a thoroughly low estimate of marriage among the mass of men could call forth such an expression as that of the panegyric. Amid this widespread decline of morality, conspicuous examples of conjugal fidelity and nobility of character among women were not of course lacking. The devotion of Caesar's daughter Julia to her husband Pompeius postponed the inevitable quarrel between him and her father. Octavia, sister of Augustus and wife of M. Antonius, stands out preeminently as the devoted protector of step-children whom she had every reason to hate as living emblems of her husband's infidelity. The inscriptions on the tombstones show that, in the humbler ranks of life at any rate, the old Roman ideal of marriage had by no means died away. The wife of a butcher on the Viminal (in an inscription of the first century B.C.) speaks as follows: 'I was called in life Aurelia Philematium, chaste and modest, a home-keeping lover of my husband (my fellow-freedman), whom, alas! I have lost. In very truth he was far more than a parent to me' (*C.I.L.* vi 9499). Such an inscription reveals the existence of another world beside that of the decadent and heartless aristocracy.

## B. UNDER THE EMPIRE.

231. Under the Empire that form of marriage (see above § 226) which did not bring the wife into the *manus* or power of her husband, became increasingly common. The *confarreate* marriage was absolutely necessary for the maintenance of a supply of candidates for the higher priesthoods. But it is thoroughly significant of the position of affairs in the time of Augustus that the *flaminica* *Dialis* should be regarded as *in manu* only so far as the *sacra* were concerned. The result of this tendency was that the woman remained (nominally) under the tutelage of her own family guardians, and that her husband's authority was seriously impaired. Legislation, moreover, was working in the direction of increased independence for women. It was easy to evade the authority of tutors by contracting a fictitious marriage, or by getting a complaisant magistrate to appoint a sham tutor. Augustus emancipated from tutelage the mother of several children. Claudius abolished the tutelage of the *agnati* or nearest male relations, which had hitherto come

<sup>1</sup> From the *Laudatio Turiae*, *C.I.L.* vi 1527; cp. Mommsen's *Jur. Schriften*, i 393 f, and W. Warde Fowler, in *Cl. Rev.* xix 261, and *Social Life at Rome* (1908), 158—167. For a summary of recent discussions, see Stein in *Bursian's Jahresber.*, 144 (1909) 338 f; for the enlarged text, Dessau, ii 8393.

into force on the death of the father. Hadrian granted women the right of disposing of their property by will. Hence it is not difficult to understand the assiduity of legacy-hunters (*captatores*) in courting the favour of rich and childless women.

Augustus had fully realised the dangers brought about by the general decay of morality. He endeavoured to restore by legislation something of the old Roman spirit. The *Lex de maritandis ordinibus* and the *Lex Papia Poppaea* aimed at making regular married life compulsory, at preventing misalliances, and at controlling divorce. A study of the literature of the early Empire will show how far success attended his efforts.

The legislation  
of Augustus.

It is scarcely unfair to cite Seneca (*De Ben.* iii 16, 2) as representative of the literary verdict of the age: *Numquid iam ulla repudio erubescit. postquam illustres quaedam ac nobiles feminae non consulum numero sed maritorum annos suos computant, et exeunt matrimonii causa, nubunt repudii?* Causes for this disregard

Women in the  
literature of  
the early  
Empire.

of the marriage-tie have already been mentioned. We may add that the early age at which girls were married exposed their inexperience to grave dangers. The age of twelve was the lower limit fixed by law, and betrothal after the age of nineteen was rare. The sudden change from the sheltered home-life to the varied temptations of society must have been responsible for much of the degradation which Juvenal in particular has painted in such vivid colours. That the demoralisation was as universal as he would have us believe is not in the least probable, and the instances of conspicuous virtue and courage on the part of women which will be mentioned presently are sufficient to persuade us that the satirist has given a very one-sided picture. The complaints against the women of the early Imperial age may be divided into complaints against their follies, and complaints against their vices. Horace had already satirised the affected taste for learning and philosophy on the part of certain women of his day, 'among whose silken pillows Stoic pamphlets loved to nestle'. In the same strain Juvenal derides the blue-stocking who makes a tasteless parade of her learning. These, however, are phenomena which accompany any movement for the higher education of women, and are no proof of any special demoralisation. Yet, however much we may suspect Juvenal of exaggeration, his graver charges against women of the upper social strata cannot be without foundation. A spirit of callousness was bred by the frequent sight of death and suffering at the gladiatorial shows. Indeed on some occasions women themselves appeared in the arena. Roman mistresses are found inflicting cruel punishments upon their maids for the most trifling offences, such as the misplacing of a single lock of their elaborately erected head-dress. Tacitus attributes much of the degradation of women in the Neronian age to the evil influences of the theatre, where women even of distinguished birth sometimes undertook most demoralising parts. Augustus had endeavoured to check some of the evil effects of the

theatre by compelling all women to sit together in the upper rows of seats. But the chief danger arose from the character of the pieces presented, as well as from the passion which women often conceived for the favourite actors of the day.

232. The early Empire witnessed many an effort to discover a religious belief which would satisfy the longings unappeased by the formalities of the old Roman religion. Women naturally took a prominent part in these movements. As at an earlier period, the ecstatic religions of the East exercised the most powerful influence. In obedience to priestly orders women were ready to dip themselves thrice in the early morning in the frozen Tiber, and to crawl a measured distance on bare knees. Above all, they found a peculiar fascination in the worship of Isis, and her numerous temples at Rome (before the time of Caracalla mainly of private origin) are evidence of the popularity of her worship. Wall-paintings from Herculaneum representing Isiac rites, and the existence of a temple of Isis at Pompeii, show that her cult was firmly rooted in these cities. That the worship of this goddess was not unattended by danger for women is proved by a conspicuous scandal in the reign of Tiberius.

233. Under the Empire great stress was laid upon a strict division of rank among women. As a rule they shared the rank of their husbands, but in some instances Emperors raised women, whose husbands were not of consular standing, to the privileges of the first class. We hear too of a *conventus matronarum*, which probably dealt with questions of court-etiquette. It is not surprising therefore to find women wielding considerable political influence. In this respect the Empresses were often conspicuous; Livia exercised a powerful influence over Augustus, and the court of Tiberius was the scene of perpetual intrigues on the part of the Imperial ladies. Agrippina, the mother of Nero, strained every nerve to get political power centred in her own hands. Plotina, the wife of Trajan, is said to have secured the succession for Hadrian. The leading ladies at court naturally used the influence of the Empress to secure appointments for those in whom they were interested. Inscriptions on the bases of statues reveal the fact that the Vestal Virgins also wielded considerable influence in this direction, high appointments being determined by their recommendations. In return, those who had benefited by their efforts set up statues in honour of their patronesses.

234. The character of an age will inevitably be judged by the tone of conduct prevailing in the highest circles. From this point of view, it is impossible to believe that the freedom accorded to women under the Empire was productive of healthful results. But, amid all the degradation which has been touched upon above, there are to be found women whose excellence could not be surpassed in an age noted for the strictest morality. Probably the



standard of conduct in the provincial towns was far higher than that which prevailed at Rome. At any rate it is to the younger Pliny, a native of Como, that we owe the description of the finest types of womanly character in the first century of the Empire. Pliny's own wife, Calpurnia, was a model of devotion to her husband, taking the keenest interest in all his pursuits. Very charming too is Pliny's description of the character of the young daughter of his friend Fundanus (her tombstone is still extant), in whom affection, intelligence, and thoughtfulness for others were united in the highest degree. The most splendid examples of womanly virtue, however, are to be found under the stress of persecution and danger. In the reign of Claudius, Arria sought to nerve her doomed husband Paetus for death by plunging the dagger into her own breast and withdrawing it with the words *Paete, non dolet*. Fannia, daughter of Thræsea and wife of Helvidius, is held up by Pliny to the admiration of the world for her combination of charm and courage. Twice she followed her husband into exile, and then suffered banishment herself for assisting in the publication of her husband's Life. Nor should the noteworthy courage of Epicharis, the freedwoman who took part in the conspiracy of Piso against Nero, pass unmentioned. She withstood the extremest tortures rather than betray her fellow-conspirators, in striking contrast to the men who vied with one another in disclosing the names of their nearest and dearest.

235. The old occupation of preparing wool—the typical work of the staid Roman woman—did not entirely die out even in late Imperial times. Symmachus, in the reign of Honorius, praises his daughter for being ‘a wool-worker and a keeper at home’. Yet such devotion to the old ideals must have been very rare under the Empire, when all the attractions of a brilliant society were open to Roman women of the upper classes. The wall-paintings of Herculaneum and Pompeii perhaps afford the best means of judging what were the favourite amusements of Roman women of culture in the first century after Christ. The pleasures of society and the delights of love find frequent illustration. Women are seen in the act of exercising those accomplishments which would enable them to shine in society. One girl is engaged in painting a Herm, while two admiring friends look on. Another, with stylus and writing-tablets in hand, is apparently occupied in writing verses, a friend meanwhile peeping over her shoulder. Literary dilettantism was a feature of the age, and, in Propertius' view, the highest praise a woman could obtain was the title of *docta*. Other paintings show that lyre-playing was much in vogue; sometimes the music-lesson itself is depicted. As the writings of the elegiac poets would lead us to expect, an inordinate amount of time was often devoted to the toilet.

Amusements  
and occupa-  
tions of  
women.

236. In any general estimate of the position of Roman women, the immense stretch of time, which lies between the early Republic and the fall of the Western Empire, must never be forgotten. At a period when the community was comparatively poor and

Summary.

engaged for the most part in agriculture, the manners of the Roman woman were naturally simple. Under such circumstances, women were content with the performance of household duties and with the simplest forms of social enjoyment. After the Second Punic war, however, Rome little by little became mistress of the resources of the civilised world. Then it was that the real temptations of her women began. Independence and wealth caused a gradual deterioration in the morals of women of the upper classes, and led to the frivolities and scandals so repeatedly dwelt on by writers of the Augustan and early Imperial age. Women of the middle and lower classes, who were not exposed to the temptations brought by wealth and idleness, maintained, as far as we can see, a comparatively high standard of conduct. This is shown by the evidence of inscriptions and the letters of the younger Pliny. In much the same way the profligate court of a Charles II did not imply a profligate middle and lower class. Those who dwelt at a distance from the capital continued to live a simple life, untouched by its vices and frivolities. These facts must be remembered in estimating the character of Roman women in the age of the declining Republic and of the Empire.

J. Donaldson, *Woman; her position and influence in ancient Greece and Rome*, Bibliography. and among the early Christians, 77—147; Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 76 ff; Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome* (Eng. Trans. 1894 ed.), i 72—78; iii 121 ff; v 391 ff; Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 57 ff; Becker and Göll, *Gallus*, ii 5 ff; Friedländer, *Sitten-geschichte*<sup>8</sup>, i 459 ff; Boissier, *La religion romaine* (ed. 4, 1892), ii 192 ff; Gide, *Étude sur la condition privée de la femme* (ed. 2, 1885), 87—163; Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Gynaeceum*; Blümner, *Privatalt.* 341 ff; Fischl, *Die Frau im römischen Altertum*, Kempten, 1911.

## V. 5. DRESS.

237. FROM the earliest times the Romans had in the *toga* a national out-door garment. But our ideas as to the form of the early *toga* must not be biassed by a familiarity with the *toga* as it appears on statues of late Republican or Imperial date. We are told that, in early times, the *toga* was worn by men and women alike; that it was used both in time of peace and in time of war; that it was, moreover, without the *sinus*, the deep semicircle of folds seen reaching down to the right knee in statues of the Imperial period. These facts would lead us to suppose that the early *toga* must have been very much less cumbersome in form than the later one, which was always regarded as the garb of peace and as eminently unsuited for war. It is impossible to imagine that in the equestrian statues of the fourth century B.C., mentioned by Livy and Pliny, the riders were represented in the multitudinous folds of the later *toga*. And yet they are said to have been represented *togati*. Evidence rather points to the fact that the *toga* in early times was a short

Earliest  
Roman dress.

mantle of thick coarse woollen stuff, fastened with a brooch (*fībula*). That this was the method of fastening is rendered probable by the discovery of such brooches in early Italian tombs. It is further probable that a survival of this early *toga*-mantle is to be found in the garment known as *trābēa*, though the latter had a special decoration of coloured stripes. The *trabea* is said to have been worn by the early kings; in later times it was the garb of the *equites* and also of priests.

238. The *toga* was by far the most important Roman garment in historic times. Although we have both elaborate literary descriptions of the method of wearing it and abundant monumental evidence, its exact form and arrangement have been matters of considerable controversy. The illustration (Fig. 7), which

Dress of men  
in later times.  
The toga.

represents a bronze statue from Herculaneum, shows the typical method of wearing the *toga* at the end of the Republic and under the Empire. The *toga* consisted of a piece of woollen stuff in the form of a segment of a circle, the base of which measured about  $18\frac{1}{2}$  feet, while the depth of the curve was about 7 feet (see diagram, Fig. 6). These dimensions have been established by M. Heuzey after a series of practical experiments. The curve was the most characteristic feature of the Roman *toga*, as distinguished from the Greek ἱμάτιον. Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes the former as οὐ τετράγωνόν γε τῷ σχήματι...ἀλλ' ἡμικύκλιον. Quintilian's words are: *ipsam togam rotundam et apte caesam velim*. In the annexed diagram the thick line near the upper edge represents the purple stripe of the *toga praetexta*.




Fig. 6. Diagram showing form of toga. After *Revue de l'Art*, i (1897) 106.

In putting on the *toga* the first step was to take the straight edge at a point about one-third of its length from *a*, one of the two corners of the garment which were called *lācīniae*, and to place it on the left shoulder. The point *a* was allowed to fall on the ground between the feet, while the curved edge of the *toga* covered the left arm. The next step was to carry the remaining two-thirds of the straight edge round the back of the neck and underneath the right arm. When, however, the main body of the *toga* was about to be brought to the front, it was grasped not on its straight edge, but about one-third of the way down its depth. The



Fig. 7. Man wearing toga. Bronze statue from Herculaneum  
(*Museo Borbonico*, vi pl. 41).



result was that one-third of the depth of the *toga* fell over to the front. Meanwhile the part of the *toga* at the level of the waist was gathered into a mass of folds, carried up in an oblique line, and thrown over the left shoulder. The mass of folds (which is seen in the illustration on the wearer's right side at the level of the waist) is likened by Quintilian to a belt (*balteus*). This, he remarks, should be neither too tight nor too loose. The next operation was the arrangement of the straight edge of the garment, which, it will be remembered, had fallen over to the front a distance of about two feet (this being a third of the depth of the *toga*). It was from this superfluous material that the *sinus* was formed, the conspicuous semicircle of folds seen reaching down to the knee in the illustration. The stuff was allowed to droop in a curve, and the end was then taken and thrown over the left shoulder. All that now remained to be done was the formation of the *umbo* or 'boss' of folds seen projecting over the *balteus* near the middle of the body. This was effected by simply pulling up a portion of that section of the *toga* which was first of all allowed to drop from the left shoulder to the ground. The result was to lift the end *a* off the ground into the position between the feet seen in the illustration. Tertullian says that the *umbo* was sometimes arranged by means of tongs (*forcipes*), a remark which will be rendered intelligible by the above description. This explanation of the arrangement of the *toga* (Heuzey's) has a great advantage over that previously in vogue. The older view was that the *sinus* consisted of a separate piece of stuff, oval in form, sewn on to the upper part of the *toga*. Experiments have demonstrated that this complication of the garment is unnecessary. That the *sinus* and *umbo* first came into fashion towards the end of the Republic is proved by the fact that earlier Republican statues do not show them.

Though the description given explains the usual mode of wearing the *toga*, there were numerous variations adapted to special circumstances. Thus the *cinctus Găbīnus* was employed when it was desired to leave the left arm free. With this object the *balteus*, instead of being thrown over the left shoulder, was carried round the waist and fastened in front. Sometimes the *umbo* was arranged in the form of a broad band of folds (*contabulatio*) across the left shoulder. It has been suggested that this was done when the *toga praetexta*, the *toga* with a purple stripe running along its straight edge, was the garment worn. By this arrangement the stripe would be displayed conspicuously. The use of the *toga praetexta* was confined to curule magistrates, the higher orders of priests, and to freeborn youths and girls. Sometimes, especially in religious ceremonies, part of the *toga* was drawn over the head as a veil; an example can be seen in the bust of M. Aurelius in the British Museum. Under the Empire the cumbersome *toga* tended to become a mere garment of ceremony, its place as an everyday outdoor cloak being taken by the *paenŭla*. The *toga* was made of a white woollen stuff, originally very thick and coarse. Dark stuff was, however, worn in sign of mourning (*toga pulla*). As time went on, the

material naturally became much finer. Candidates for office had their *toga* specially whitened by chalk (*toga cretata*); generals at their triumphs and magistrates at the games given by them wore a purple *toga*.

239. It is said that the *toga* was, in early times, occasionally worn alone, but this was probably only the case when hard manual labour was indulged in. The under-garments ordinarily worn were the *subūcula* and the *tunica*. Nothing is known as to the shape of the former. The *tunica* (the ordinary indoor dress) was a simple shirt-like garment made of two pieces of linen or woollen stuff sewn together. As a rule it had short sleeves (as may be seen in the figure illustrated), rarely long ones (*tunicae mānīcatae*); these latter were regarded as a sign of effeminacy. The tunic was often girded with a belt (*cingulum*), and fell, as a rule, a little way below the knees. For the tunic and belt, see the first Fig., and, for the tunic with sleeves worn under the *toga*, the tenth Fig. in Chap. VII 2, *Sculpture*; also, for the tunic and *toga*, *British Museum Guide to...Greek and Roman Life*, Fig. 119.

Other upper garments were worn from time to time. Such was the *paenūla* already mentioned, a cloak worn by both men and women as an additional wrap in cold or wet weather, and more particularly on the occasion of a journey. It was made of a thick and coarse material (*gausāpe*). Its form is not a matter of absolute certainty, but the most probable view is that it was a cloak of the poncho type, with a single opening at the top through which the head was slipped<sup>1</sup>. The traveller in the illustration (Fig. 8), taken from a relief found at Aesernia, wears a cloak



Fig. 8. Traveller in *paenula* reckoning with hostess in *stola*.  
*Bull. Arch. Nap.* I vi, tav. 1, 4 (1848).

<sup>1</sup> Milo *paenulatus* is described by Cicero as *paenula inretitus* (*pro Milone*, 54); and, when Varro calls on Cicero at an inconvenient time, the host does not take off his guest's *paenula*, or press him to stay (*ad Att.* xiii 33, 4, 'sed non ut paenulam stringerem').

of this kind, which has in addition a hood (*cucullus*). The hostess, with whom he is reckoning, wears a long tunic or *stola*. The *lacerna*, of much later introduction than the *paenula*, was an open cloak resembling the Greek *chlamys*, generally fastened on the right shoulder with a brooch (*fibula*). It was originally worn only by soldiers, but later it became a garment of fashion, often conspicuous for its gay colours, though sometimes white. The *laena* appears to have been a thick mantle corresponding to the Greek *χλαῖνα*. It was worn by soldiers and priests, and was frequently used as an overcoat by diners-out. Like the *lacerna*, it was often gay-coloured.

240. The dress of women consisted as a rule of three garments, the *tunica interior* or *subucula*, the *stola*, and the *palla*. The *stola*, which corresponded to the tunic worn by men, was the ordinary indoor garment. It was generally provided with short sleeves; when it was without them, it was fastened on either shoulder with a *fibula*, in which case the *tunica interior* was sleeved, as we can see from statues. The *stola* reached to the feet, and (if the wearer was a *matrona*) had a narrow border called *instita* sewn to it at the bottom. It was girt under the breasts, where a fold was frequently allowed to hang over the girdle. The right of wearing special *stolae* was sometimes granted to women under the Empire as a sign of honour. The inscriptions speak of *stolatae feminae*, who had probably received this honour. The distinguishing feature seems to have been a gold border (*pātāgūm*). In early Republican times the extra wrap worn by women out of doors had been the *rica* or *ricinium*, a garment of doubtful form, but perhaps an oblong of stuff worn over the head as a veil. In historical times women's outdoor cloak was the *palla*, a large rectangular piece of woollen stuff corresponding closely to the Greek *ἱμάτιον*. Such a garment naturally admitted of an almost infinite variety of adjustment. From a description of Apuleius it would appear that the normal arrangement closely resembled that of the *toga* before the introduction of *sinus* and *umbo*. About one-third of the garment was allowed to hang in front over the left shoulder. The remainder was then passed round the back, under the right arm, and carried obliquely across the body, the end being finally thrown either over the left shoulder or the left arm. Sometimes, as in the illustration (Fig. 9), the *palla* was carried round *over* the right shoulder, instead of being passed under the right arm; occasionally it was thrown over the head as a veil. The *palla* is sometimes spoken of as a regular garment (*indumentum*) in contrast to its normal use as an over-wrap (*amictus*). As this special *palla* is confined to gods and heroes, it seems a likely conjecture that it should be identified with the long chiton worn by Apollo *Mūsāgētēs*<sup>1</sup>. As regards material, the *palla* was made of wool. Pompeian wall-paintings show that it was frequently of bright colour, though sometimes also white or black.

Women's  
garments.

<sup>1</sup> The second syllable is long in 'Pindar', Frag. 82, Μουσᾶγέτας, Doric for Μουσῆγητης; but is shortened *metri gratia* in late Greek and late Latin verse.



Fig. 9. Woman wearing palla. Marble statue from Herculaneum  
(*Museo Borbonico*, ii pl. 41).



Another garment worn by women was the *suppārus* or *suppārum*, concerning which we know nothing except that it was an upper garment made of linen and that it reached to the feet. It was worn especially by girls.

241. In the earliest period the Romans wore their hair and beard long, and were noted for their *incompti capilli*. Barbers are said to have been first introduced into Rome from Sicily in 300 B.C., but the younger Scipio Africanus is credited with having been the first to shave habitually. From his time up to the reign of Hadrian Romans were usually clean-shaven, as we know from the monuments. Hadrian reintroduced the fashion of wearing a beard, a fashion which continued till the time of Constantine. Except as a sign of mourning, the hair was generally kept short. The Romans were in the habit of going out bare-headed, supplying the want of a hat, if need arose, by drawing part of the *toga* over their head, or by pulling up the hood (*cucullus*) attached to their cloak. There were of course exceptions to this rule. Augustus is said to have been fond of the broad-brimmed Greek *petāsōs*, which he wore even at home, whenever he was in the open air. Another broad-brimmed hat sometimes worn was the *causia* of Macedonian origin. Occasionally the conical felt cap called *pilleus* was used, chiefly, however, by those who had just acquired their freedom. Persons who led an open-air life, such as fishermen or huntsmen, wore caps made of plaited straw, felt, or leather.

Head-dress  
of men.

242. In the early Republican period Roman women seem to have done their hair in the simplest possible fashion. In the first century B.C. the coins depicting Victory or Diana enable us to realise the mode in vogue at that time. A roll of hair is worn over the forehead and carried up on either side of the head to the crown, where the locks are gathered up in a peculiar tuft. This fashion is illustrated in Fig. 10 by coin (*a*), which belongs to 16 B.C., and shows a bust of Victory wearing the head-dress of a girl of the time. Matrons wore their hair in a peculiar pyramidal knot (*tūtulus*) on the top of their head. In Ovid's day the varieties of coiffure were exceedingly numerous, but the monuments of the early years of the Empire still show a comparative simplicity of head-dress. The chief characteristic of hair-dressing at this time is the club of hair falling on the back of the neck. This is seen on coin (*b*), which shows a portrait of Agrippina the elder who died in 33 A.D. Under the Flavians, however, enormous fringes (*orbes*) come into fashion. The portrait of Julia, daughter of Titus (coin *c*), supplies a good illustration. Sabina, the wife of Hadrian (coin *d*), has an elaborate series of plaits, apparently fitted over a metal circlet. In the second half of the second century A.D. there is a return to simplicity, as is seen, for example, in the case of Faustina the younger, the wife of M. Aurelius (coin *e*). She has her hair done in a simple knot behind, and adorns it with a fillet only. In the third century the favourite mode is a series of parallel waves, falling

Head-dress  
of women.

down on the neck in a heavy mass and there gathered into a small knot. The head of Julia Mamaea, mother of the Emperor Severus Alexander (coin *f*), gives a good idea of this style.



Fig. 10. Coins showing various modes of hair-dressing. (*a*) Victory on coin of gens Autistia, 16 B.C. (*b*) Agrippina I. (*c*) Iulia Titi. (*d*) Sabina, wife of Hadrian. (*e*) Faustina II. (*f*) Iulia Mamaea. From the British Museum.

243. The correct 'full-dress' boot was the *calceus*, the national foot-covering of the Roman, which formed a kind of complement to the *toga*—*proprium togae tormentum* is the expression used by Tertullian. It was made of soft leather and completely covered the foot, being fastened in front by means of thongs. There were different kinds of *calcei*, varying according to the rank of the wearer. The simplest kind worn by ordinary people may have resembled No. 4 in the illustration (Fig. 11); in early times it seems to have been called *pero*. The most important variety was the *calceus senatorius* (Nos. 1—3), the chief characteristic of which was the four latches (*corrigiae*) seen in the illustration. Two were wound round the bottom of the leg and tied in front; the other two were wound higher, up to the level of the calf, and then tied in similar fashion. Another feature of the senatorial *calceus*

Coverings for  
the feet.

which does not appear on the monuments, was the crescent-shaped ivory ornament called *lunula* attached to the front of the boot. The senatorial *calceus* was probably made of black leather (*nigra alūta*). Another variety was the *mulleus*, at first confined to patrician magistrates; it was distinguished by its high sole and red colour, and was fastened above by means of hooks and thongs. The *cālga* (Nos. 5—7) was a heavy boot with hob-nailed sole, worn chiefly by soldiers and peasants. The illustration shows a bronze lamp in the form of this kind of boot. For indoor wear sandals (*soleae* or *sandalia*) were chiefly employed. These consisted of a leather sole fastened to the foot by means of interlacing thongs. They were worn also by diners-out, who took them off when they reclined at table. The asking for the sandals (*poscere soleas*) was the signal of retirement from a feast. Slippers (*socci*) of various colours were also worn. Women seem to have used the same kinds of boots and shoes as men.



Fig. 11. Various forms of foot-covering. From Baumeister's *Denkmäler*, vol. i p. 575.

244. Finger-rings (*ānuli*) were commonly worn by both men and women. In early times the ring (which usually had, for the purpose of sealing, an engraved design) was made of iron, except in the case of senators, ambassadors, and other distinguished persons, who had the privilege of assuming the gold ring. Gradually the right of wearing the gold ring spread through all classes, until under the later Empire all free-born persons could use it. The writers of the early Empire make frequent

Ornaments.

allusion to the numbers and weight of rings worn, and their testimony is amply confirmed by the Roman rings preserved to-day in Museums. The third century A.D. in particular must have witnessed a veritable passion for ring-wearing, Elagabalus, for example, is said to have worn a fresh ring every day. Hence it is not surprising to find Roman rings of this century very largely represented in collections. Roman ladies under the Empire were passionately fond of jewellery, as the elder Pliny testifies. Their principal ornaments were earrings (*inaures*), necklaces (*mōnīlia*), armlets (*armillae*), breast-chains passing over either shoulder and meeting between the breasts, and brooches (*fibulae*). The distinguishing features of Roman jewellery are coarse massiveness and lavish employment of precious stones, especially garnets (*carbunculi*), sapphires (*hyacinthi*), emeralds (*smaragdi*), plasmas (*prasi*), and pearls (*margaritae*). The scene in Petronius's 'Supper of Trimalchio,' where the host sends for scales to prove the colossal weight of his wife's jewellery, is of course a burlesque, but it is a good indication of the taste in jewellery which prevailed among the Romans.

(1) **Dress.** Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Toga, Palla, Stola*, etc.; Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, s.v. *Toga*; Heuzey in *Revue de l'Art ancien et moderne*, i 98—107 and 204—214; ii 193—203 and 295—304; Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Pallium* (for women's dress and the *paenula*); Helbig in *Hermes*, xxxix (1904), 161 ff ('*Toga und Trabea*'); W. Amelung, *Die Gewandung der alten Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig, 1903 (explanatory text to Cybulska's plates illustrating Greek and Roman Antiquities). The two chief ancient authorities are Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* xi 3 § 137 ff, and Tertullian, *de pallio*, 5. See also Blümner, *Privatalt.*, 205 ff.

(2) **Head-dress.** Lady Evans in *Numismatic Chron.*, 1906, 37—65; Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Coma*; Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Coma* and *Barba*; Pauly and Wissowa, s.v. *Bart*; Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 597 ff; Becker and Göll, iii 237 ff; Bernoulli, *Röm. Ikonographie, passim*; Baumeister, *Denkmäler*, s.v. *Kopfbedeckung, Barttracht, Haartracht*; Bull. della Comm. arch. com., 1904, 93 ff ('*Petaseus e causia*'); Steininger, *Die weiblichen Haartrachten im 1. Jahrh.*, 1909; Blümner, *Privatalt.* 267 ff.

(3) **Jewellery.** *Brit. Mus. Cat. of Rings* and *Brit. Mus. Cat. of Jewellery*.

(4) **Coverings for the feet.** *Dictionaries of Ant.*, s.v. *Calceus, Caliga*, etc.; Baumeister, s.v. *Fussbekleidung*; Marquardt and Mau, 588 ff; Becker and Göll, iii 227 ff; Jakobi, *Das Römerkastell Saalburg*, 495 ff.

## V. 6. DAILY LIFE.

### A. DIVISION OF TIME.

245. IN the earliest period, before the Romans became acquainted with Greek sundials, there were no means of reckoning time with any degree of accuracy. All that could be done was to take sunrise and sunset as fixed points, and to calculate the intervening periods as nearly as possible by the position of the sun. In the XII Tables sunrise, midday, and sunset found mention as points of time. The introduction of sundials (*solaria*)



took place in 293 B.C. according to Pliny, in 263 B.C. according to Varro. These earliest sundials, however, were brought in from Sicily, and were in consequence inaccurate for the different latitude of Rome. A correct sundial was introduced by Q. Marcius Philippus in 164 B.C. In 159 B.C. P. Scipio Nasica made his countrymen acquainted with the water-clock (*clepsidra*), an instrument constructed on the principle of the hour-glass, which considerably facilitated an accurate division of the hours.

The Romans reckoned their day and night from sunrise to sunset and from sunset to sunrise respectively. Each day and night was divided into twelve *horae*, which necessarily varied in length according to the season of the year. Only at the equinoxes were the hours of equal length. The question has arisen as to what the Romans really meant when they spoke of the first hour, the second hour, and so forth. Did they mean the completed hour or the space between the hour named and the preceding hour? Bilfinger has shown by an exhaustive study of passages in Latin literature that the Romans, in the great majority of instances, referred to the completed hour, just as we ourselves do. In other words, when they spoke of the first hour, they referred to a point of time. The following table (taken from Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, p. 257 f) shows the Roman hours expressed in our terms of time at the summer and winter solstice respectively.

Hour	Summer	Winter
Sunrise	4. 27'	7. 33'
First	5. 42' . 30''	8. 17' . 30''
Second	6. 58'	9. 2'
Third	8. 13' . 30''	9. 46' . 30''
Fourth	9. 29'	10. 31'
Fifth	10. 44' . 30''	11. 15' . 30''
Sixth	12	12
Seventh	1. 15' . 30''	12. 44' . 30''
Eighth	2. 31'	1. 29'
Ninth	3. 46' . 30''	2. 13' . 30''
Tenth	5. 2'	2. 58'
Eleventh	6. 17' . 30''	3. 42' . 30''
Twelfth (sunset)	7. 33	4. 27'

The night was also divided into four watches (*vigiliae*), which were clearly military in origin, and further into eight rather vague sections, viz. *vespera*, *prima fax*, *concupia*, *intempesta*, *mediae noctis inclinatio*, *gallicinium*, *conticinium*, *diluculum*. Though sundials and water-clocks became fairly

common in private houses, it was a frequent practice to employ slaves to watch the public sundials and to bring back word of the time to their masters. That sundials must have been pretty numerous is shown by the fact that thirteen have been discovered in the neighbourhood of Rome, and fourteen in that of Pompeii. Many others have been found in different parts of the Roman world.

Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Horologium*; Mayor *ad* Juvenal, x 216; Bilfinger, *Die antiken Stundenangaben*, Stuttgart, 1888; Becker and Göll, *Bibliography.* ii 406 ff; Marquardt and Mau, 253 ff and 788 ff; Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Clepsydra*, *Horologium*. For an illustration of a Roman sundial, see A. H. Smith, *B.M. Cat. of Sculpture*, iii No. 2545, fig. 68. See also Blümner, *Privatalt.* 372 ff.

## B. TOWN-LIFE.

246. OUR knowledge of Roman town-life is practically confined to that of Rome itself. Of life in provincial towns we have surprisingly little information. We may, however, reasonably suppose that it was, on a smaller scale, a replica of life in the capital. In Rome noise and bustle began at an early hour, and Horace implies that sleep could hardly be prolonged as late as the first hour (say 7 o'clock). In Republican times it was the custom for the master of the house to rise at daybreak and offer sacrifice with his family (including the slaves). Under the Empire, however, to which period this description mainly applies, the custom would scarcely be widespread, though some families, such as that of Antoninus Pius, were rigorous in observing it. Martial says that the first and second hours (about 7 till 9) were taken up with the *salutatio* or duty visit paid by the clients to their patrons. They assembled in the entrance corridor (*vestibulum*), whence they were admitted into the *atrium*, and received by the master of the house in turn, often without any pretence of welcome. The old relation between patron and client, which was of real help to both parties, had degenerated into a merely tedious formality, with the inevitable result that the client came to be treated in the contemptuous fashion so vividly pictured by Juvenal. The next three hours were given over by the more earnest section of society to the serious business of the day, though Galen, writing in the second century after Christ, says that a large number went to view charioteers and pantomimists, or else killed time with love-making, gambling, and other frivolous pursuits. The third hour (say 9 to 10) was especially devoted to the business of the law-courts—*exercet raucos tertia cauidicos*, is the expression of Martial. Under the Empire the bar was practically the only profession open to men of social standing, for that or the army had fallen into disrepute. Some estimate of the importance attached to the profession of pleader may be formed from a perusal of the letters of the younger Pliny. We cannot help feeling, however, that it was

Morning  
occupations.

valued chiefly for the opportunities it afforded for the display of rhetorical powers. Pliny rather characteristically favours a long speech. Among other claims of business hours should be reckoned the duty of acting as assessor to magistrates, that of witnessing wills and assisting at other legal formalities, as well as complimentary visits and the solemn function of listening to a friend's literary recitations. Pliny, in contrasting the busy idleness of the town with the industrious leisure of the country, gives the following reply to the question 'What have you done to-day?' *officio togae uirilis interfui, sponsalia aut nuptias frequentavi, ille me ad signandum testamentum, ille in aduocationem, ille in consilium rogauit* (Epp. i 9). Presumably this was a typical day's work in town.

It should be borne in mind that the Roman spent a very large portion of his time in places of public resort, such as the forum, shops, and baths. The forum was primarily a market-place, where country-produce and other wares were displayed for sale. But besides this, it was, like the Italian piazza, a place where all sorts and conditions of people loved to congregate and discuss the topics of the day. From a room at Pompeii there is a series of wall-paintings representing scenes from daily life in the forum. We see the boot-maker, the baker, and the ironmonger all engaged in selling their wares. In another picture a notary is writing from dictation. A third scene shows four citizens reading a public notice written on a board attached to the bases of three equestrian statues. Such pictures are enough to show how prominent a position the forum took in the daily life of Roman people.

At the sixth hour (12 o'clock) the midday meal (*prandium*) was taken, and this was followed by a short siesta (*meridiatio*).

247. A couplet in the Greek Anthology runs: *ἐξ ὧραι μόχθοις ἱκανώταται, αἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτὰς | γράμμασι δεικνύμεναι ΖΗΘΙ λέγονσι βροτοῖς.*

The Roman practice was in accordance with this counsel.

Afternoon  
occupations.

The morning was, as a rule, devoted to work, the rest of the day to exercise and pleasure. The eighth and ninth hours (say 1.30 to 3.30 p.m.) were spent in taking exercise. The more active betook themselves to the *Campus Martius* or to the *palaestrae* of the baths, where running, wrestling, spear-throwing, disk-hurling, boxing, jumping, and other forms of athletics were indulged in. Swimming could be practised in the Tiber. Older men took gentler exercise, such as ball-playing, a pastime which had a great vogue among Romans of all ages. Even Augustus, Maecenas, and other illustrious persons did not disdain this form of recreation. The favourite Roman ball-game was the *trigon*, in which three players stood at the angles of a triangle and passed the ball (*pīla*) from one to the other. The game is perhaps represented in an ancient painting (from the baths now known as Trajan's), where three youths are seen throwing up balls in the presence of a fourth bearded man, possibly a professional coach. The *harpastum* was another ball game of rather obscure character. Besides the small *pīla* a large air-inflated ball known as the *follis* was

sometimes used, apparently somewhat after the manner of our 'punch-ball'. Most of these forms of exercise were, however, but preliminaries leading up to the bath, which in late Republican and Imperial times came to be regarded as an indispensable public institution. Seneca notes that

in the time of Scipio Africanus Roman baths, whether public or private, were small and inconvenient, while the aediles kept a very strict watch to prevent the introduction of unnecessary luxuries. Such restrictions, however, could not avail for long, and there was doubtless an ever-increasing elaboration of arrangement, until under the Empire we find huge buildings such as the *Thermae* of Trajan, Caracalla, and Diocletian, which were capable of accommodatating thousands of persons at one and the same time. The hour at which the public baths opened, varied. Hadrian, for example, forbade anyone, except under special circumstances, to enter them before the eighth hour (about 2 o'clock), or to remain in them after sunset. Severus Alexander, on the other hand, had them kept open from sunrise till late at night. At Metallum Vipascense in Spain the bath was reserved for women in the morning up to the seventh hour. From the eighth hour to the second hour of the night it was open to men. The normal time for bathing, however, was in summer about the eighth, in winter about the ninth hour (we may say 2.30 p.m.), the time at which that pattern of methodical habits, Pliny's friend Spurrinna, used to take his bath. The bather generally went through a variety of processes. After completing his athletic exercise, he would enter the *Apodytērion* and take off his clothes. He next proceeded to the warm air room or *Tepidarium*, which served as a preliminary to the *Caldarium*, a hot air room, where, after profuse perspiration, he took a warm bath. An alternative to the latter room was the *Lacōnīcum*, a circular room heated to a very high temperature and corresponding to the modern Turkish bath. The bather next returned to the *Apodyterium* and took a cold bath in that room, or in the adjoining *Frigidarium*, if there was one. He returned once again to the *Caldarium* or *Laconicum*, and was finally rubbed down. Of course such an elaborate series of processes was not always gone through; the mode of bathing naturally varied with the tastes and constitution of the individual. Some were content with a plunge in the *piscīna* or *natatio*, a cold swimming tank attached to the *palaestra* of the baths. When the regular course was taken, unguents were rubbed in during the sweating, and also immediately before dressing, in the latter case with a view to the prevention of cold. The unguent flask was called *ampulla*, and the instrument used for removing oil was the *strigilis*, a curved scraper made of bronze or iron. In the British Museum is an interesting bathing outfit found in a Roman tomb near Düsseldorf, consisting of strigils and oil-flasks both of metal and glass.

Public baths were frequented by women as well as men. As a rule the larger baths, such as the Stabian and Forum baths at Pompeii, were divided into separate portions for men and women. Otherwise, as at



Metallum Vipascense, one part of the day was set aside for women-bathers. It is strange that the great *Thermae* at Rome apparently had no special section for women. Promiscuous bathing is mentioned with disapprobation by the elder Pliny, and the edicts issued against it by Hadrian, M. Aurelius, and Severus Alexander, show that the practice was not uncommon under the Empire. The mad Elägäbälus gave formal permission for men and women to bathe together.

The prices of entrance to the baths seem to have been very low. At Rome the *quadrans*, or smallest bronze coin, is frequently mentioned as the usual fee, though it is possible that this admitted only to baths of a low class. Women were charged a higher fee than men. Thus at the baths of Metallum Vipascense already mentioned, they paid one *as* against the half *as* paid by men. Sometimes magistrates during their term of office provided a sum of money to enable their fellow-citizens to bathe without cost. Minors, soldiers, freedmen of the Emperor and others were systematically admitted free.

248. In early Republican times the stock dish of the Romans was a kind of porridge called *puls*, made from spelt (*far*). Even in Imperial times this continued to be eaten by the lower classes, and was, in a characteristic Roman way, retained in religious rites. The *puls* was eaten with green vegetables (*olera*), seldom with meat. Cooks were not introduced into Rome until about 190 B.C., as the result of contact with the East, and bakers (*pistores*) do not appear till about 174 B.C. Previously the baking was done by family slaves, a practice which continued to some extent in later times, as is shown by the baking rooms found in Pompeian houses.

Meals and  
food.

The Romans generally took two principal meals in the day, viz. the *prandium* and the *cena*. Besides these, breakfast, called *ientaculum*, was often taken about the third or fourth hour (say 9 o'clock). It consisted as a rule of bread eaten with dried fruits, honey, or cheese. The middle-day meal was the *prandium*, which in most cases probably consisted of the cold remains from the *cena* of the previous evening, though warm meats are sometimes mentioned. This middle-day meal was in early times the principal one of the day, and was itself called *cena*; the evening meal was then known as *uesperna* or (perhaps) *merenda*. In the best-known period, however, the chief meal was the *cena*, which was taken after the bath. The hour would of course vary to some extent. Martial gives the ninth hour as the normal one (*imperat exstructos frangere nona toros*). This would be in summer a little before 4 o'clock; in winter the actual time was probably a little earlier, though the hour was nominally a later one, the tenth. The *cena* was a lengthy repast, so much so that the elder Pliny was thought extraordinarily moderate in devoting only three hours to it. It consisted of three parts, the *gustus* (otherwise called *gustatio* or *promulsis*), the *cena* proper in several courses (*fercula*), and the *mensae secundae* or dessert. At the preliminary *gustus* foods calculated to whet the appetite were served,

such as lettuces, shell-fish, and very commonly eggs, as we are reminded by the Horatian *ab ovo usque ad mala*, meaning 'from start to finish.' *Mulsum*, a mixture of honey and wine, was usually drunk. The *fercula*, the trays or 'courses' of the *cena* proper, were in early times limited to two, later on three were usual, though increasing luxury tended to heighten the number, until we arrive at the twenty-two of Elagabalus. All manner of flesh, fish, fowl, and fruit were served at these splendid banquets. After the *cena* proper an offering was made to the Lares; then followed dessert (*mensae secundae*), consisting of cakes, fresh and dried fruits, etc. (*bellaria*). As a typical *menu* of a modest dinner we may select that given by Martial in an invitation to half-a-dozen friends. Mallows, lettuces, leeks, mint, and a dish of fish and chopped eggs formed the *gustus*, and preceded the more substantial kid, rissoles (*ofellae*) and chicken and ham of the *cena*, which was to be served as one course. The dessert was to consist of apples, and a flagon of Nomentane wine.




Fig. 12. Diagrams showing arrangement of a triclinium.

(1) Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, p. 295, 1879. (2) ed. Mau, p. 304, 1886.

249. The table at a dinner was surrounded on three of its four sides by couches (*triclinium*), arranged in the manner shown in the diagram (Fig. 12 (2)). That this rather unsymmetrical arrangement was the normal one is proved by the fact that the Pompeian dining-rooms are only wide enough for one length and one breadth of a couch, not for one length and two breadths, as would be required for the formerly accepted positions (1). The open side of the table enabled the servants to hand the food. The guests, after removing their sandals (*soleae*), reclined on their left elbow, which rested on a cushion. The couches (*lecti*) were known as *summus*, *medius*, and *imus* according to their respective dignity. The positions on the couches varied in point of honour as shown in the figure. There was, however, one anomaly. The

Arrangement  
of a triclinium.

most honourable position of all was not, as we should expect, *summus* 1, but *medius* 3, a position called the *locus consularis* and always given to the chief guest. The host generally placed himself next to this guest of the evening at *imus* 1, though there were exceptions to this custom, as, for instance, at the banquet of Nasidienus described by Horace, at which Maecenas occupied the *locus consularis*, but the host Nasidienus was at *imus* 2. Towards the end of the Republic, when *mensae citreae* of circular form (*sigmata*) came into fashion, the couches were often arranged in a crescent, in which case the positions of honour were at the extremities of the horn. As knives and forks were not used at Roman banquets, a good criterion of a guest's breeding was furnished by the way in which he ate.

250. Drinking at the *cena* was moderate, but it was frequently followed by a drinking bout called *cōmissatio*. One of the guests was chosen *magister* or *arbiter bibendi*, and his function was to decide the respective proportions of wine and water. The drinking was after Greek fashion, a certain number of cyathi having to be quaffed at a draught. The expressions used in health drinking were *bene tibi*, *bene te*, or *uiuas*.

The comissatio. Wines,

The best wines came from Campania, and of these the *Caecubum* and *Setinum* were the most noted. The second rank was taken by the *Falernum* and *Massicum*, which came from the southern slopes of the hills parting Latium and Campania. Sinuessa also was famous for the excellent wines produced in its neighbourhood. The poorest sorts of wine were the *Sabinum*, *Veientanum*, and, conspicuously, the *Vaticanum*. Greek wines, such as the Thasian and the Chian, were imported to a considerable extent.

251. A description of town-life would be very incomplete without some reference to the state of the streets at Rome and their reputation for security. The third satire of Juvenal (written, it must be remembered, after the improvements under Nero) may not be free from exaggeration, but it certainly gives a most vivid picture of the streets and their dangers. They were so narrow that the pedestrian was pushed and jostled at every turn—a fact which explains the provision of the *Lex Iulia Municipalis*, which (with a few exceptions) forbade vehicular traffic in the city between sunrise and about 4 p.m. The houses were built to a great height, and even a garret commanded a high rent. Under such crowded conditions it is easy to understand the constant occurrence of fires, as well as the continual accidents caused by objects dropping from roofs or windows upon the heads of unhappy pedestrians. At night the dangers were increased manyfold. Extraordinary as it may seem, it is almost certain that there was no public system of street-lighting. The wayfarer had to grope along, as best he could, with the aid of a lantern or torches. The result may easily be imagined. The city was infested by foot-pads and by bands of 'Mohawks', the latter composed of youths of the upper class bent on doing mischief. A less serious, but very annoying

The streets of Rome.

nightly disturbance was the din of the wheeled traffic, which, being forbidden by day, was perforce conducted during the hours of darkness. The state of the roads at Pompeii enables us to realise to some extent what the clatter must have been like.

General reference may be made to W. Warde Fowler, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*; Samuel Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*; W. R. Inge, *Society in Rome under the Caesars*; Lanciani, *Ancient Rome in the light of recent discoveries*; Guhl u. Koner, *Leben d. Griechen u. Römer*<sup>6</sup>. See also Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 258—340; Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*<sup>8</sup>, i 409 ff; Blümner, *Privataltertümer*, 385 ff. For baths, cf. Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>8</sup> and Dâremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Balneae*; Pauly and Wissowa, s.v. *Bäder*; Baumeister, s.v. *Thermen*; Mau and Kelsey, *Pompeii*, 180 ff. For meals, see Becker and Göll, iii 311 ff: *Notizie degli scavi*, 1892, 46 ff (wall-painting representing slaves leading guests to their places at a banquet).

### C. TRAVELLING.

**252.** THE great heat and unhealthiness of Rome in the height of summer naturally drove all who could to escape from the city into the country. The favourite resorts were the Alban mountains and the watering places on the sea coast of Latium and Campania. Alba, Tusculum, Antium, Cumae, and, above all, Baiae were the most frequented. In winter, places in southern Italy, such as Velia, Salernum, and notably Tarentum, were visited by many. The richer citizens possessed numerous country seats (*uillae*); Cicero, for example, had eight, Pompeius an equal number. The Emperors in particular had villas of great magnificence at all the favourite country resorts. The district lying round Rome was also studded with country seats, which could be visited by their owners for a day or two, even when business in the capital was in full swing. Travelling for pleasure and recreation outside Italy became very common under the Empire. The prevailing taste was, as it were, summed up in the person of the Emperor Hadrian, who visited almost every part of his vast dominions.

In a description of daily life our chief concern is with the mode of travelling and the character of the vehicles used. As a typical piece of travelling in Italy the journey of Horace from Rome to Brundisium, as described by himself, may be selected. He occupied probably 15 days over the 374 miles, an average of 25 miles a day; but he expressly notes that his journey was a leisurely one. He complains of the roughness of the Appian way, which made it unsuitable for fast travel, and of the badness of the water at Forum Appi—the latter a drawback severely felt by travellers in Italy. The inns (*caupōnae* or *tabernae*) seem to have been of a primitive description, and indeed their reputation never stood very high in ancient Italy. In

Favourite  
resorts in  
Italy.

Mode of  
travelling.



compensation, the charges were not exorbitant, if we may take the interesting inscribed relief from Aesernia (figured above, § 239) as a guide. The inscription above the relief details the charges made to the traveller, viz. one *as* for bread and wine, two *asses* for *pulmentarium* (relish), two *asses* for the mule's provender, etc. The relief is of early Imperial date, and seems to point to a moderate tariff prevailing at that time. (Inscription in *C.I.L.* ix 2689; Dessau, no. 7478.)

Great changes must have taken place in the nature of Roman vehicles during the lapse of centuries. The best course is to select those in use at the time of the early Empire as typical. We may begin with a form of conveyance used both in town and country—the *lectica*. This had probably been introduced from the East in the second century before Christ. Its form may be gathered from the accompanying illustration (Fig. 13), which shows a *lectica* reconstructed from fragments found on the




Fig 13. *Lectica*. From the *Bulletino d. Comm. Arch. Comunale*, ix (1881), p. 214, pl. 15.

Esquiline in 1874. It consists of a portable couch with head-rest, carried on poles (*assēres*). The *lectica* was generally supplied with a cover of leather (*pellis*) and with curtains (*uēla* or *plāgae*) at the sides. Later on windows of talc (?)—*lapis specularis*—were substituted for curtains. The number of bearers (*lecticarii*) varied, but there were sometimes as many as six or eight,

in which case the litter was called *hexaphōron* and *octophōron* respectively. A later variety of the litter was the *sella gestatoria*—a kind of sedan-chair. The litter was much used in Rome, where wheeled carriages were practically forbidden in the day-time. Outside the city wheeled conveyances were of course freely employed. At the gates of towns carriages could be hired from posting corporations (*collegia cisiariorum* or *iumentariorum*). The most important conveyance for travellers was the *raeda*, a Gallic four-wheeled carriage regularly used for the transport of families and luggage. It will be remembered that this was the vehicle into which Juvenal's Umbricius packed all his belongings, when moving from Rome into the country. For fast and light travelling there were two-wheeled cars, such as the *cisium* or *essēdum*. Another two-wheeled vehicle which deserves special mention is the *carpentum*. It was frequently employed as a state-carriage, but was also in general use. Its form (after the special elaborations have been subtracted) may be judged from the *carpentum* depicted on a coin struck in memory of Agrippina by her son Caligula (Fig. 14). This particular *carpentum* of Agrippina took part in the procession of the circensian games.




Fig. 14. *Carpentum* of Agrippina the elder.  
From a coin in the British Museum.

It is drawn by mules, which, together with the swift Gallic cobs called *manni*, were in principal demand for the drawing of carriages. Independent travellers frequently rode a horse or a mule. (On some of the wider aspects of travel in the Roman Empire, see Chapter VI 10 B, *Roads and Travel*.)

Lanciani, *Ancient Rome in the light of recent discoveries*, 264 ff; Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 728 ff; Becker and Göll, iii 1 ff; Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*<sup>8</sup>, ii 3—292 (*Das Verkehrswesen und Die Reisen der Touristen*); *Dicts. of Ant.*, s.v. *Lectica*, *Raeda*, etc.; Schreiber and Anderson, *Atlas*, pl. lxii; *Mélanges Boissier*, 127 ff (*Les peintures de la caupona de la rue de Mercure à Pompéi*); Blumner, *Privataltertümer*, 442 ff.

## D. COUNTRY-LIFE.

253. THE manner of life led by the farmer of the Republic can be gathered from the description of Roman agriculture given in the next section. Something may here be said as to the country-life of the leisured under the Empire.

It is to the younger Pliny that we owe a glimpse of the manner in which the cultivated Roman of the time of the Empire spent his days when living at his country seat. He has left us a very full description of his Laurentine villa, one of those numerous country seats within a comparatively short distance of Rome, to which the jaded man of affairs could fly, when he felt the need of a short respite from the turmoil of the city. The most noteworthy features of Pliny's villa were the varied prospects of sea and land which could be obtained from it, and the remarkable extent and completeness of its arrangements, although he modestly terms it *villa usibus capax, non sumptuosa tutela*. The garden was arranged in terraces, but was apparently (after the manner of Roman gardens) stiff and formal, as well as deficient in variety of flowers and trees. The Romans at the time of the early Empire had a passion for building their villas in out-of-the-way situations, a fact of which we are reminded when we look at Roman wall-paintings, where country houses are frequently seen built far out into the water. Two wall-paintings in the British Museum from Boscoreale show villas practically standing in the sea. They are an apt illustration of Horace's lines.

Country-life  
under the  
Empire.

'Contracta pisces aequora sentiunt  
Iactis in altum molibus: huc frequens  
Caementa demittit redemptor  
Cum famulis dominusque terrae  
Fastidiosus'. (Carm. iii 1, 33 f.)

Pliny also possessed villas at Como which were built in positions characteristic of the prevailing fashion. He had, he says, many villas in the district, but two gave him special delight: *altera imposita saxis more Baiano lacum prospicit, altera aequae more Baiano lacum tangit* (Epp. ix 7). The latter was indeed so close to the lake that one might fish from the bedroom windows. Pliny himself, like Cicero before him, valued country-life chiefly for the sake of the beauties of nature, and for the opportunities it afforded of following literary pursuits in peace and quietness. Even when he went on a hunting expedition he took care to carry his note-books with him. But, in inviting a friend to come and make a stay, he holds out as inducements the excellent fishing and hunting which Como and its district afford. His usual routine in the country was to rise about six o'clock, spend most of the morning in literary work, either indoors or in the open air, finishing up with a short drive. The midday siesta followed. The afternoon was passed in walking, reciting aloud, taking gymnastic exercise

and in bathing. After dinner, the evening was spent in conversation or in reading with his wife and a few friends. Sometimes after dinner an actor or a musician would provide entertainment. Occasionally walking and driving were varied by riding exercise. Pliny's life in the country may be taken as typical of that in favour with Roman gentlemen of refined taste in late Republican and Imperial times. It is easy to understand that persons of the stamp of Petronius's Trimalchio would carry their ostentatious luxury into the country, and call forth complaints such as those of Juvenal against one who 'decked his lofty villas on the Praenestine hills with Greek marbles and marbles sought from far countries, outdoing the temples of Fortune and Hercules' (xiv 88 f).

Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 174 ff.

## V. 7. AGRICULTURE.

**254.** THE early history of Rome is inseparably bound up with the tillage of the soil. It is not without reason that Cicero in the *de senectute* makes Cato dwell upon the pleasures of country-life, and hold up to admiration the farmer-heroes of Rome. A glance at the principal Roman festivals is sufficient to convince us of the estimation in which agriculture was held, at least in the early period of Roman history. The *Floralia*, *Vinalia*, *Fordicidia*, *Cerealia*, *Parilia*, *Robigalia*, and other festivals of like character speak of the hopes and fears of the Roman farmer, and of his anxiety to propitiate the deities on whose goodwill the safety of his crops and his herds was considered to depend. Another sign of the high value set upon farming is the existence of important Latin treatises written upon the art, in several cases by men of approved eminence in other spheres of activity. In the first half of the second century B.C. the elder Cato wrote a work *de agricultura* dealing in a characteristically brief and pithy manner with the practical questions which were involved in farming. Towards the end of the first century the encyclopaedic Varro, at eighty years of age, wrote three books *de re rustica* in the form of a dialogue. Virgil's *Georgics* combine a sound knowledge of agriculture with an unrivalled poetical charm. In the early years of the Empire the Spaniard Columella wrote an elegant treatise on agriculture in twelve books, laying stress upon the value to the farmer of a thorough technical knowledge. Finally, Palladius in the fourth century gathered together in fourteen books the information gleaned from earlier writers on the subject. It is to the authors named that we owe most of our knowledge of Roman agriculture.

**255.** The climate of Italy naturally varied considerably in different parts in consequence of its great extension from North to South. Nevertheless it was, as a whole, admirably adapted to agriculture. In the North the great plain of the Po was

Importance of  
agriculture in  
Roman  
history.

Land and  
climate.



suited, as Strabo remarks, for the growth of all kinds of crops. The lower slopes of the mountains were covered with the olive and the vine. The natural heat of the country was tempered by the seas on either hand, as well as by cold winds blowing from the Alps. The Romans themselves were enthusiastic in the praise of their climate. Virgil is typical:

‘Hic uer adsiduū atque alienis mensibus aestas,  
Bis grauidae pecudes, bis pomis utilis arbor’.

(*Georg.* ii 149.)

Central Italy, though as a whole mild, was naturally affected by the Apennine range, where the upland valleys would experience the full rigours of winter. Moreover, there is good reason to believe that the climate of ancient Italy was considerably colder than that of the present day. Contrasts of temperature would be especially marked in Southern Italy, where the difference between the climate of the lowlands and uplands is very striking. These contrasts were used with good effect in the selection of summer and winter pastures for cattle. The chief drawbacks to the climate of Italy were the prevalence of malaria in marshy districts and the inconvenience caused by droughts. Hence in mountainous parts an effort was made to overcome the latter by means of trenches (*incilia*) conducting water from the hills—a system employed on an immense scale in modern India.

‘Deinde satis fluuiū inducit riuosque sequentes,  
Et cum exustus ager morientibus aestuat herbis,  
Ecce supercilio cliuosi tramitis undam  
Elicit’.

(*Georg.* i 106 f.)

256. In the history of Roman husbandry two periods may be broadly distinguished. The first, up to about 200 B.C., may be called the period of small holdings. During this time, while Roman economy remained undisturbed by the influence of oversea possessions, the small landed proprietor was the backbone of the State. His importance is clearly seen in the predominance exercised by the twenty-one country tribes (*tribus rusticae*) over the four city tribes, the latter coming to be regarded as only fit for inferior or dishonoured citizens. Pliny also notes that names so illustrious as those of the Fabii, Lentuli, and others, are reminiscent of the soil; that to be careless of the tillage of the land was an offence incurring the Censor's ban; that, in the words of Cato, there could be no higher praise than to call a man a good husbandman. The second period (after 200 B.C.) is marked by the growth of large estates and the gradual extinction of the small landed proprietor. It was the natural outcome of the expansion of Rome. Corn could be grown far more cheaply in Sicily and Africa than in Italy, and its import meant the ruin of the Roman farmer. The result was that the breeding of cattle and the cultivation of the vine became the most remunerative agricultural pursuits. The work, moreover, was carried

Development  
of Roman  
husbandry.

out chiefly by the labour of slaves for the benefit of absentee landlords, who cared for little else than the revenues which they could manage to draw from their wide domains.

257. In the earlier period an estate (*fundus*) was generally of modest extent, for this was practically rendered necessary by the primitive character of agricultural instruments. Cato held that the

Estates.

most desirable estate was one of 240 *ingera* (160 acres), comprising all sorts of ground, fit at once for vine and olive-plantations, meadow-land, garden produce, and for the growth of corn. The prime requisite was a healthy situation, if possible at the foot of a wooded hill with a south or east aspect. Cato warns the would-be proprietor against excessive haste to build. When he did begin, he would normally provide himself with two sets of farm buildings, viz. the *uilla urbana* for himself and his family, and the *uilla rustica* for the bailiff (*villicus*) and the slave hands (*familia rustica*); the latter building included also stalls for animals (*stabula*), various store-rooms, the wine-press (*torcular*), etc. The court-yard (*cohors*) contained sheds (*tecta*) for waggons and implements, and also a pond (*lacus*) for the farm-animals. A good idea of a well-built Roman country-house can be obtained from a study of the *uilla rustica* discovered at Boscoreale near Pompeii. This house is divided into two parts. On the one hand, the *uilla urbana* consists of a peristyle (a court surrounded by columns), from which bed-rooms, a dining room, and a bath-room open out. On the other, the *uilla rustica* has an elaborate wine-press, a large room for storing wine-jars, an oil-press and reservoir, a barn for storing grain, and several rooms for slaves.

258. In the earliest period the chief object of cultivation must have been grain. Yet by the time of Cato (early second century B.C.) the vineyard was placed first in point of remunerativeness.

Fruits and  
Crops.


Next in order followed the vegetable-garden, the osier-copse, the olive-plantation, the meadow yielding hay, the cornfield, the copse, wood for felling, and the oak-forest. Varro remarks (and he remarks it with enthusiasm) that in his day the whole of Italy resembled a fruit-garden. By the time of Domitian the cultivation of the vine was so universal that he contemplated setting a legal limit to its extent with a view to the promotion of the growth of wheat. The situation of the farm also affected the nature of its products. In the neighbourhood of a town attention was devoted chiefly to the growth of flowers and fruit, since these were easily transported and commanded a ready sale. Wheat, wine, and oil, being less perishable, could be produced at a considerable distance from their market. It should be borne in mind that many of the products which to-day seem most characteristic of Italy, were quite unknown to the Romans. Such are maize, lemons, oranges, and the aloe, all of which are of comparatively modern introduction.

259. Soils were roughly classified according to richness or poverty, softness or tenacity, wetness or dryness. The best land, according to Colu-

mella, was that which combined richness with softness. But before crops could be grown, much work had to be done on the land.

The system recommended by Varro and Virgil is the 'two-field' system, which required that the land should lie fallow (*ueruactum*) every other year. Later on, the 'three-field' system took its place, in which the land lay fallow every third year. Usually wheat was grown the first year, lighter crops or vegetables the second. The principal implements employed in the tillage of the ground were the *sarculum* (*sarculum bicornis*, when double), a light hoe used for loosening the soil; the *ligo* and the *bidens*, heavier varieties of the hoe used for tearing up roots; *rutrum*, a kind of spade, with the handle set at right angles to the blade, much used for digging up ground, etc.; the *rastrum*, a two, three, or four-pronged instrument, corresponding to our rake, and used principally to break up the large clods left by the plough; the *pala*, resembling our spade; *crates*, a wicker-hurdle used for levelling the ground after ploughing; the *irpex*, a wooden board studded with iron teeth and used as a harrow. Several of these implements can be identified with objects found at Pompeii and the Saalburg. The most important instrument was of course the plough. The first ploughing (*proscissio*) generally took place in the second half of April, the second (*iteratio*) about the time of the summer solstice, the third (*tertiare*) in the autumn. The essential part of the plough (*aratrum*) is the plough-stock or *buris*, which can itself be used

The preparation of the soil.



(a) The *buris*. (b) The plough, including the *buris*.

Fig. 15. Diagram of plough. (From Page's ed. of the *Bucolics and Georgics*, p. 203, ed. 1907 etc. See also diagrams facing p. 100 in J. H. Voss' German transl., vol. iii, 1800, and on pp. 113—116 of R. Braungart's *Urheimat der Landwirtschaft...*, 1912.)

as a rudimentary plough (Fig. 15 a). A more highly developed form is described in Virgil's *First Georgic*, 165—175 (cp. Fig. 15 b).

This includes a plough-stock (*buris*) made of elm wood, from the upper part of which extends a pole or shaft (*temo*) eight feet long, ending with a yoke (*iugum*). Fastened to the plough-stock are two mould-boards (*aures*), to throw aside the mould when it was desired to plough in seed, and two share-beams (*dentalia*), so called because they converge to a point sheathed by the *dens*, the iron plough-share or *uomer*. To the plough-stock is also attached the plough-handle, *stima* (probably fitted with a cross-piece), which enabled the ploughman to guide the movements of the plough.

An earlier type of plough may be seen in Fig. 16, which depicts an

Etruscan bronze group found at Arezzo. The plough, here drawn by two oxen and guided by the ploughman, appears to consist of a single wooden beam, bent into a curved form, and serving at once as *buris* and *dentalia*. The share is lashed on separately underneath. The handle is apparently in one piece with the *buris*. The iron shares from Roman ploughs have




Fig. 16. Etruscan plough with oxen (yoke reproduced separately above).  
Bronze from Arezzo, in Micali's *Monumenti* (1832), pl. cxiv.

sometimes been found (e.g. at the Saalburg), but the other parts, being of wood, have naturally perished.

260. As a rule sowing took place in the autumn, but in the case of the less hardy crops spring was sometimes preferred. Spring-sowing was also common in cold and snowy regions. Harvest-time varied from June to October according to the district.

Sowing and  
harvest.

For the important operation of harvest, day-labourers were hired to assist the slaves. The cutting was done with the sickle (*falx*), of which there were several varieties, the principal being the *falx stramentaria* or *messoria*—a curved knife with a short handle—and the *falx denticulata*, which was supplied with saw-like teeth. The corn was sometimes cut close to the ground; sometimes (in Picenum for example) only the ears were cut off, and the straw was left standing till it was required for use. The threshing was carried out by means of the *tribulum*, a wooden board studded with sharp stones or iron nails, which was drawn over the ears. Other instruments of the same kind were the *traha* and the *plaustellum Punicum*. Sometimes oxen or horses were driven over the threshing floor (*area*), stamping the corn with their hoofs. The simplest method of threshing was by means of flails (*perticae*). Winnowing was done with the *uannus*, a large flat wicker basket, in which the ears were shaken



till all the husks were driven out, or else by throwing the grain into the air with a shovel (*pala lignea*) and letting the wind carry away the chaff.

261. In the early period the breeding of cattle (*pastio agrestis*) had been of comparatively little importance. Their use had been practically confined to farm work. When, however, the growing of corn ceased to be profitable, large landowners, who possessed numerous slaves, found that cattle brought in the best return. The geographical formation of Italy was such that mountain and plain supplemented each other as summer and winter pastures respectively. The younger Pliny says that on approaching his Laurentine villa he was greeted by the sight of flocks and herds, *quae montibus hieme depulsa herbis et tepore uerno nitescant*. Sheep-breeding was of especial importance, but goats, swine, kine, asses, horses, and mules were also reared. Besides the *pastio agrestis* there was the *pastio uillatica*, a term applied to the breeding of small animals, such as fowls, rabbits, etc., which could be fed within the farm-yard or in its immediate vicinity.

Rearing of  
animals.

Dickson, *The Husbandry of the Ancients*, Edin. 1788; Daubeny, *Lectures on Roman Husbandry*; Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Agricultura*; Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome* (Eng. trans. 1894), iii 64—82; Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, i 374 ff; F. Orth, *Der Feldbau der Römer*, 1900 (a good summary); Pauly and Wissowa, and Baumeister, s.v. *Ackerbau*; Jakobi, *Das Römerkastell Saalburg* (for agricultural implements); Gradmann, *Der Getreidebau im deutschen und römischen Altertum*, Jena, 1909; Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Rustica Res*; Blümner, *Privataltertümer*, 533 ff.

Bibliography.

## V. 8. HOUSE AND FURNITURE.

262. THE form of the earliest Italian house is brought before us by the terracotta urns in the shape of huts, which were first discovered in 1817 near Albano. They were evidently used as receptacles for the ashes of the dead, which thus rested in models of the dwellings occupied in life. Fig. 17 shows one of these hut-urns, a circular building which probably had a roof of thatch and wattled walls. In the bar we may perhaps recognise the inner bar of the door, transferred to the outside in the model for convenience' sake. These hut-urns give us an idea of the primitive dwellings of the Latin shepherds, of which the *casa Romuli* and the temple of Vesta were survivals. The next development is probably illustrated by another monument, also a cinerary urn, found at Chiusi (Fig. 18). This is in the form of a rectangular building, with a small opening in the roof, which would serve at once for the admission of light and the emission of smoke from the hearth. It is natural to recognise in this building the earliest form of Italian *atrium*, that apartment with open roof, which was to remain the character-

Early Italian  
Houses.

istic feature of the Roman house in historic times. At present, be it noted, the roof slopes outwards, not inwards.




Fig. 17. Hut-urn. *Annali dell' Istituto*, 1871, pl. U, 9.




Fig. 18. Cinerary urn in form of a house. W. L. A. R. Abeken's *Mittelitalien* (1843), pl. iii, 6.

263. For a reconstruction of the Roman house we have abundant materials in the ruins of Pompeii, and these are supplemented by the

account given by Vitruvius in the sixth book of his work *de architectura*. The first important fact to grasp in connexion with the Roman house is this—that it looked inwards and not outwards. Its air and light were received mainly from within. The windows on the outside, when they did occur, were very small, as may be seen from the restored view of the house of the Vettii given below (Fig. 20).

Roman house  
of historic  
times.

In early Republican times the *atrium* was the chief room of the house, which was in fact at first called by that name. The *atrium* was an oblong apartment, with a roof which sloped inwards and downwards, in such a way as to leave a rectangular opening over the central part of the floor. This form of *atrium*, in which the roof was supported by two beams thrown across the length of the room and strengthened towards their middle with cross-beams (*interpensulae*), was called *tuscanicum*, and was by far the commonest. The sloping roof was termed *compluvium*, because it served, by means of gutters (*colliciae*), to collect the rain water. Beneath the rectangular opening in the roof was a corresponding basin in the floor, intended to catch the water as it fell; this basin was called *impluvium*. Besides the *atrium tuscanicum*, Vitruvius mentions four other forms of *atrium*, viz. the *Corinthium*, in which the roof-beams were supported by several columns, as in the house of Epidius Rufus at Pompeii, where there are sixteen columns round the *impluvium*; the *tetrastylum*, in which there were only four columns, one at each angle of the *impluvium*; the *displuviatum*, which was so arranged that the roof sloped outwards, with the result that the rain water fell outside the walls; and finally the *testudinatum*, in which the roof completely covered the room, rising tent-like to a point. The *atrium*, which most probably got its name from *ater* on account of the blackening caused by the hearth-smoke, was originally the living room of the family. Here the mistress used to sit and superintend the work of her handmaids; here the family generally took their meals; here was placed, in the farther end opposite the entrance, the *lectus genialis* or marriage bed of the master and mistress. Little by little a series of extra rooms was formed round the *atrium*, such as may be seen in the house of the Surgeon at Pompeii, the main part of which was certainly built before 200 B.C. They were of very small dimensions, and were used chiefly as bed-rooms and dining-rooms. At the back of this early Roman house, unaffected as yet by Greek influence, ran a garden.

Early Roman  
House. The  
Atrium.

264. As time went on, probably in the course of the second century B.C., this early form of house underwent a considerable change. This was due to the contact of Rome with Greece. Fig. 19 shows an ideal plan of the new form of house, based on the evidence afforded by the ruins of Pompeii. The new house differs from the old chiefly through the addition of the *peristylum*, a garden enclosed by a colonnade and surrounding rooms. This form of house remained in use

The Graeco-  
Roman house.

during the late Republican and the Imperial periods. Hence it may be regarded as representative of what is generally understood by the 'Roman house'. Between the *atrium* and the street there was usually, though not




Fig. 19. Plan of normal Pompeian house. Mau, *Pompeji in Leben und Kunst*, p. 230, fig. 116.

invariably, a recess of corridor form (*locus ante ianuam domus uacuus*, as it is called by Gellius quoting from C. Aelius Gallus), known as *uestibulum*. The two projections on the plan represent the doorposts. The *ianua* consisted of two heavy folding doors (*ualuae*), and invariably opened inwards. Hence it could be closed by a bar (*sëra*), which was fitted into the passage walls immediately behind it; this is shown by the existence of holes in these walls in Pompeian houses, as well as by references in literature, e.g. in Petronius's 'Banquet of Trimalchio': *dum loquimur, sera sua sponte delapsa cecidit reclusaeque subito fores admiserunt intrantem*. The passage lying behind the door was (probably) known as *fauces*. The ordinary house entrance was doubtless in Virgil's mind, when he wrote his description of the gateway of Hades:

'Vestibulum ante ipsum primisque in faucibus Orci  
Luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia curae'. (Aen. vi 273 f.)

The rooms on either side of the entrance corridor were as a rule not regarded as part of the house, though sometimes connected with it. They were frequently let as shops (*tabernae*). The small rooms on either side of the *atrium* were used as bed-rooms (*cubicula*). These to our ideas were very cramped, though their height was considerable. At either end of the *atrium* there was an open recess called *ala*, and here, in the case of distinguished families, were kept the portrait-masks (*imagines*) of the ancestors. At the back of the *atrium*, and only separated from it by a curtain, was the *tablinum*. This room may have grown out of a verandah made of boards (*tabulae*), originally attached to the back wall of the *atrium*, and used in summer as a cool dining-room. Later on it took the form of a regular room, opening into both the *atrium* and the *peristylum*, and was sometimes still used as a dining-room, but more frequently as a reception



room. The rooms on either side of the *tablinum* were generally used as dining-rooms, the smaller of the two (on the right) being separated from it by a passage called *andrōn*, which led into the peristyle.

With the advent of the Graeco-Roman period the life of the family was passed more and more in the peristyle and less and less in the *atrium*. The peristyle offered far greater privacy and an ampler space—it was in fact much more modern in its arrangements. It consisted of a central garden, bordered on four, three, or two sides by columns. A separate entrance (*posticum*) usually gave admission to it from a side street. The small rooms on the plan represent bed-rooms, which differed from those of the *atrium* in being lower and having broader entrances. In some cases the bed was placed in a separate alcove (*zōthēca*). Doors were doubtless left open in summer time, otherwise the tiny bed-rooms would have been unbearable. Now that the Greek custom of reclining at meals was firmly established in Italy, special dining-rooms with three couches (*triclinia*) were built in the peristyle. These rooms were for the most part only just large enough to accommodate the three couches and the table, and to give the necessary space for serving (see above, Fig. 12); sometimes, however, a larger and more elaborately decorated apartment called *oecus* is found. At the far end of the peristyle a deep recess, called the *exēdra*, afforded a convenient room for social purposes. The position of the kitchen (*cūlina*) varied; the most important object in it was the hearth (*focus*), a specially built oblong of masonry. The kitchen frequently contained a niche for the household gods (*Lares*); sometimes these were painted on the wall, together with a serpent representing the genius of the house. In the neighbourhood of the kitchen was generally placed the *lūtrina*, and, in larger houses, the bath-room.

265. Among the prodigies mentioned by Livy under the year 218 B.C. is that of an ox which climbed up from the street to the third floor of a house. In the *Amphitruo* of Plautus Jupiter is made to say of himself: '*in superiore qui habito cenaculo*'. Upper stories. These passages seem to show that upper stories (called *cōnīcula*, says Varro, because it was the custom to dine in them) were fairly common in Rome by the end of the third century B.C. At the same time it is pretty certain that these upper rooms were used for many purposes besides dining. At Pompeii second story rooms were rare before the first century B.C., common afterwards; in order to make space for them, it was the practice to lower the rooms opening from the *atrium*, and to build above these. The passage of Livy cited above shows that there was sometimes a separate staircase leading from the street to the upper stories, so that it would not be necessary to enter them by the main door of the house. Hence they could conveniently be let out as apartments. In some cases the upper room projected partly over the street in the form of a balcony called *maenianum*. In Rome such projections were repeatedly forbidden under the Empire, but without much effect.

266. The accompanying illustration (Fig. 20) represents an outside view of the house of the Vettii at Pompeii, restored. Several features in it call for special note. First we may remark the large area of blank wall presented both on the front and on the side. The windows on the front are exceedingly small, and are evidently quite subordinate to the openings of the two *atria*

A Roman house seen from without.




Fig. 20. House of the Vettii, restored. Mau, *Pompeii*, p. 310, fig. 155.

(the house of the Vettii has a small second *atrium*), as far as regards lighting value. The three windows over the door gave light to an upper story room, which derived no light from the *atrium*. At the back is seen the large opening of the peristyle. If this is contrasted with the openings of the *atria*, it is easy to realise how much more light and airy this later part of the Roman house must have been, and how much more suitable for family residence. Under the changed conditions, the *atrium* was used chiefly as a reception hall.

Fig. 21 shows a sectional view of the inside of the house of the Tragic Poet at Pompeii. This house was probably built not long before the destruction of the city in 79 A.D. In the *fauces*, or entrance corridor, is seen a door, which led into a large shop, probably belonging to the owner of the house. There was a similar shop on the other side of the corridor. The staircase at the beginning of the *atrium* gave access to the upper story, the large door

A Roman house seen from within.

opposite the middle led into a sleeping apartment. The lowness of the peristyle as compared with the *atrium* should be noticed. The rich wall-paintings, of especial excellence in the house of the Tragic Poet, are indicated in the figure as regards their main divisions.




Fig. 21. Section through the house of the Tragic Poet, restored.  
Mau, *Pompeii*, fig. 154, p. 304, ed. 1900 (Mau-Kelsey, p. 316, ed. 1902).

267. A brief summary of the development of wall-decoration in Roman houses may here be given, mainly as it can be traced at Pompeii. The first beginnings date from the second century B.C., when the method employed in the case of inner walls was to paint them with coloured panels imitating the effect of marble. The walls were carefully prepared with several coatings of plaster and stucco; the paint was then laid on while the stucco was still moist (fresco). As a rule only such rooms as kitchens, store-rooms, and the apartments for slaves had plain plastered walls. In the first century B.C. what may be called the Architectural style came into vogue. Its chief characteristic was the appearance of architectural projection produced by skilful painting. The paintings in the so-called house of Livia at Rome may be instanced as representative of this style, with which regular pictures first came into fashion in Roman wall-painting. In the third or Ornate style the architectural features pass away into the merely fantastic, and become simply a framework for an elaborate central picture. The third style extends from about the Augustan period to 50 A.D. The fourth or Intricate style is characterised by a return to architecture of a very airy and fantastic kind, amid which figures imitating sculptures are freely inserted. Large pictures are frequently framed in panels imitating tapestry work. With this style the history of Pompeian wall-decoration closes, owing to the destruction of the city.

Wall  
decoration.

268. Private houses at Rome were doubtless built on much the same plan as those at Pompeii, though in many cases on a very much grander scale. Rome, however, stands apart in one respect, viz. in the great preponderance of the dwellings termed *insulae*. Festus describes these as buildings *quae non iunguntur communibus parietibus*

*Insulae.*

*cum vicinis circuituque publico aut privato cinguntur*, a definition perhaps reminiscent of the days of the XII Tables, which ordered that there should be a space of two and a half feet clear round each house. Later on, however, when Rome became crowded, pressure of space led to the building of great blocks of tenements let out to several families after the manner of our flats. The term *insula* was then applied to the block of flats in opposition to that of *domus*, which denoted a single private house. In Rome these blocks were sometimes raised to an excessive height. Complaints were made on this score as early as the beginning of the last century of the Republic, and we know that Augustus and Trajan made seventy and sixty feet respectively the limit of height. That these tenement buildings greatly outnumbered the private houses in Rome is shown by the fact that, in statistical documents drawn up in the fourth century of the Empire, the *insulae* outnumber the *domus* in the proportion of about twenty-five to one. Though the accuracy of the statistics may be doubted, there is no reason to question the correctness of the main fact. It is pretty clear that, under the Empire at least, private houses were confined to the wealthy few. The *insulae* were under the charge of an *insularius*, who, though a slave, held a position decidedly superior to that of a porter in a modern set of flats, and was responsible for the collection of rents.

269. Judged by the modern standard, Roman houses seem to have been

very scantily furnished. One reason for this was doubtless

Furniture. the nature of the climate which made it desirable to leave as much open space as possible; another may be found in the comparatively short space of time spent indoors. Carpets were unknown, the floors being made of concrete; a fine sort was that called *opus Signinum*, formed of finely pounded tiles, and decorated on the surface with patterns marked in small stone cubes. The houses of the wealthy had floors with elaborate mosaic designs, a conspicuous example being the house of the Faun at Pompeii. Curtains (*aulaea*) were sometimes drawn over the opening in the roof of the *atrium* to keep out the heat of the sun, and on festal occasions the walls and the columns of the peristyle were decorated with tapestry. The beds, couches, tables, and chairs were generally made of wood, and have in consequence perished. Our information as to their form has to be drawn from elaborate specimens in bronze or marble and from representations on wall-paintings or sculptured reliefs. The Roman dining-couch (*lectus tricliniaris*) was distinguished by name from the bed (*lectus cubicularis*), but there does not seem to have been any great difference of form between them. The earlier type of couch, derived from the Hellenistic form, had no back, but was furnished with end-rests (*fulcra*), which were often decorated with bronze or ivory (cp. *Museum Guide*, 121 f). The really Roman couch, however, was distinguished by its back (*pluteus*). Interlacing thongs or cords (*fasciae*, *instillae*, or *lora*) were stretched across the framework to support the mattress (*culcita*, *torus*).



The general term for coverlets was *strāgula*. The Romans were very lavish in their expenditure on tables. Fig. 22 shows a round marble table




Fig. 22. Marble table. Overbeck-Mau, *Pompeii*, p. 428.

from Pompeii, perhaps a *mensa Delphica*, as this was the term applied to tables with three legs. Wooden tables, generally of rectangular form, were called *abaci*; circular tables of finely veined Mauretanian *citrus* wood, *monopodia*. Of chairs the most dignified was the *cathedra*, which had a sloping back, but no arms. The commoner form of seat, however, was the backless *sella*, two examples of which are illustrated in Fig. 23; they are




Fig. 23. Two bronze sellae. Overbeck-Mau, *Pompeii*, p. 426.

in bronze, from Pompeii. Other articles of furniture which should be mentioned are the tall bronze *candelabra* or lampstands designed to carry one or several of the oil lamps everywhere used by the Romans for lighting purposes. These lamps range from small singlewick hand-lamps to large hanging-lamps with numerous wicks placed in a circle. Common lamps were made of clay, superior ones of bronze. The great variety of Roman household utensils in bronze and pottery can only be realised by a study of them in a great Museum. The best collection is that of the Naples Museum, which contains those recovered from Pompeii. The splendid

silver service found in the *uilla rustica* at Boscoreale, north of Pompeii, shows how magnificent was the plate used by wealthy Romans.

(a) **House.** Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Domus*; Mau and Kelsey, *Pompeii*, part 2; Overbeck and Mau, *Pompeii*, 244 ff; Baumeister, s.v. *Pompeii*; *Mélanges Boissier*, 45 ff (origin of *tablinum*); Daremberg et Saglio, s.v. *Domus*; Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 213 ff; for the *insulae*, cf. Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations*, 90 ff and 564 ff; Richter in *Hermes*, xx (1885), 91 ff; De Marchi, *Ricerche intorno alle insule*, etc. (in *R. Instit. lomb., Memorie*, xviii (1891), 241 ff); for wall-decoration, see Mau, *Geschichte der decorativen Wandmalerei*. See also W. Warde Fowler, *The decay of Roman home life, shown from the history of the Roman House*, in *Classical Assoc. Proc.* 1907, 83—92; Blümner, *Privataltertümer*, 7 ff.

(b) **Furniture.** Mau and Kelsey, *op. cit.* ch. xlv; Overbeck and Mau, *op. cit.* p. 422 ff; Ransom, *Couches and Beds of the Greeks, Etruscans, and Romans*; Becker and Göll, ii 329 ff; Baumeister, s.v. *Betten, Tische, Sessel*, etc.; *Dicts. of Ant.*, s.v. *Cathedra, Mensa, Lectus, Sella*, etc.; for illustrations, cp. also Schreiber and Anderson, *Atlas*, pl. lxxxvi; *Museo Borbonico, passim*; *Monuments Piot*, v (for the Boscoreale treasure). See also the 'Room of Greek and Roman Life in the British Museum', and the *Guide* to the same (1908).

## V. 9. EDUCATION.

270. THE history of Roman Education falls naturally into four periods.

Four periods. The first, when education at Rome was free from foreign influences, ended about 250 B.C. From that time till about 100 B.C. was the period when the national education was transformed by Greek influence. The new system flourished for about two centuries, 100 B.C.—100 A.D. Then followed the period of decadence. These dates, it must be noted, are only approximations; for, in the nature of the case, no year can be definitely fixed upon as the beginning, or the end, of a period.

271. The first period cannot be delineated with completeness and certainty, since there are no contemporary accounts. Nor

First period,  
ending  
c. 250 B.C.

can the references in later writers be altogether trusted, for we do not know how far they are accurate representations of the past. Nevertheless, certain inferences may with some confidence be drawn from them. The training of this period possessed in full that characteristic which Roman education never wholly lost: it was pre-eminently practical. 'Quid esse igitur censes, Laeli, discendum nobis?' is the question asked by Cicero (*de Rep.* i 20, 33), and the answer is 'Eas artes quae efficiant ut usui ciuitati simus'. The aim was to inculcate good morals, to awaken patriotism, to make the child fit for all duties which, in the house or outside of it, would fall upon the grown-up man or woman. The training was also conservative: the *mos maiorum* must be maintained. What the fathers themselves were, they made their sons; who in turn made their sons the same (Pliny, *Ep.* viii 14, 4 f). This

conservatism rendered State-regulation unnecessary. It was certain that the *patria potestas* would be exercised to waken the boy's intellect, and to train him to become a good *paterfamilias* and a worthy citizen. Hence the non-existence—then and till quite late—of State-control, an omission which Polybius considered worthy of censure (*Cic. de Rep.* iv 3, 3).

272. The children received their earliest training from the mother. Tacitus (*Dial.* 28 f) praises this as superior to the hiring of nurses. It was, he remarks, the mother's pride to manage her house and to care for her children: at times an elderly kinswoman was entrusted with all the children of the household. This method continued to the end of the Republic. Tacitus adds that the kinswoman regulated the child's recreations and games. What these were he does not say, but they cannot have been much different from those in vogue at a later period. These were playing with dolls, riding hobby-horses, whipping tops, walking on stilts, playing ducks and drakes, blind-man's buff, various games with nuts (used sometimes as our marbles, sometimes for odd and even), and several kinds of ball-playing. When the children grew older, the father took part in their training. The parents carefully attended to the bodily health and strength of the children; and endeavoured to imbue them with respect for the laws and with fear of the gods, and to make them modest in speech, discreet in behaviour, thrifty and self-reliant. The older lads were constantly with their father, and by seeing what he did and sharing in it, they learned their future duties. They assisted in the service of the gods; they listened as their father gave advice to his clients; and from him they learned the traditions about the family and the national heroes. In honour of their ancestors songs were sung at banquets by the boys, as we are told by Varro: 'In conuiuiis pueri modesti ut cantarent carmina antiqua, in quibus laudes erant maiorum, et assa uoce et tibicine' (*apud Non. s.v. assa uoce*). Such songs, and hymns like the *Carmen Aruale*, supplied the elements, however rude, of poetry and music. Boys accompanied their father to the Senate-house and out to dinner. The girls learned to manage the house, to spin and to weave; the boys to plough, to sow, and to reap. The latter were also taught by their father the exercises that would give them bodily strength and fitness for war—running, leaping, wrestling, boxing, riding, swimming, and the use of weapons. Instruction in reading, writing and calculation, so far as required for household- and State-purposes, was imparted by the father. Cato the elder, in whose time Greek innovations were introduced, clung to the old custom, and, though possessing a slave who taught children, acted himself as his son's *γραμματιστής* and *νομοδιδάκτης*, for he would have no slave to instruct his son. We hear of this paternal tuition down to imperial times. Instruction in law is referred to by Plautus, who says of parents:—

'Expoliunt, docent litteras, iura, leges  
Sumptu suo et labore'.

(*Most.* 126 f.)

The Laws of the XII Tables were learned by heart; a practice which Cicero (*de Leg.* ii 9 and 59) mentions as existing in his boyhood but discontinued when he was writing.

273. For this type of education schools were not necessary; but in course of time they sprang up, though we cannot say when.

Schools.

Tradition makes them belong to very early days. Livy, when he speaks of Verginia entering the Forum, adds 'ibi namque in tabernis litterarum ludi erant' (iii 44). Some critics accuse Livy of romancing here, especially as Plutarch expressly states that Spurius Carvilius, a freedman of the consul Spurius Carvilius, was the first to open a school at Rome: ὁψὲ ἤρξαντο μισθοῦ διδάσκειν, καὶ πρῶτος ἀνέφξε γραμματοδιδασκαλεῖον Σπῦριος Καρβίλιος, ἀπελεύθερος Καρβιλίου τοῦ πρώτου γαμετήν ἐκβαλόντος (*Quaest. Rom.* 59). The date is about 250 B.C. To reconcile Livy and Plutarch, it has been suggested that, while Carvilius was the first to charge fees, the teachers of the schools previously existing had been recompensed by voluntary gifts. The school of Carvilius seems to have been a *ludus litterarius*, the kind of school kept by a *litterator*, usually a freedman or a slave, who taught the same elementary subjects as parents did at home.

274. During the third century B.C. Greek influence in Rome rapidly increased, owing to closer intercourse with the Greek colonies in Italy and to the influx of Greek slaves. Romans also, who visited Greece, came in contact with the forces of Greek life, art and literature. About the time of the Second Punic War Livius Andronicus, and at a later date Ennius, gave literary instruction in Rome (Suet. *de Gram.* 1 f). It was at first restricted to private houses. Shortly after 169 B.C. Crates of Mallos lectured on literary subjects in Rome, and his method served as a model to others. This was the introduction of the school of the *grammaticus* or *litteratus*, the Greek language teacher—an innovation, the importance of which we can hardly overrate. It was not a mere widening of the curriculum: it was the introduction of a new principle. Practical utility did not vanish from Roman education, but a type of general literary culture now made its appearance: something which pointed the way to *humanitas*, instruction in subjects 'quae repertae sunt, ut puerorum mentes ad humanitatem fingerentur atque uirtutem' (Cic. *de Orat.* iii 58). The mainspring of the new training was the interpretation of a Greek poet, e.g. Homer, who for many generations continued the favourite. The translation of the *Odyssey* by Livius Andronicus was also used; and, as Latin literature arose, instruction in it was given on the same lines as in Greek. Hence we find *grammatici Latini* in addition to *grammatici Graeci*. Greek innovations in education, not less than in other departments of life, were distasteful to Cato, whose sturdy adherence to the national system has been mentioned above (§ 272). Yet, for purposes of oratory, Cato studied Demosthenes and the speeches in Thucydides, though in regard to Greek

Second period,  
c. 250—100 B.C.

Literary  
instruction.



literature he held it good—so he told his son—‘*inspicere, non perdiscere*’. For the training of a *uir bonus* and a worthy citizen, the essentials in Cato’s opinion were oratory, agriculture, law, medicine, war: a striking contrast to the literary culture supplied by the *grammaticus*.

275. During this period schools of rhetoric, at first exclusively Greek, were opened for instruction in public oratory. The value of this training, which was confined to the upper ranks of the citizens, was fully recognised in the second century B.C.

Rhetorical  
schools.

But no welcome was given to attempts to supersede Greek rhetoric by Latin. To prevent that, even the State interfered; and, in 161 B.C., ‘*philosophi et rhetores Latini*’ were banished by the Senate. Yet Latin rhetoricians appeared once more, for, in 92 B.C., the censors prohibited Latin schools of rhetoric as haunts of idleness and as ‘*praeter consuetudinem ac morem maiorum*’ (Suet. *de Rhet.* 1 f; Gellius, *N. A.* xv 11).

276. In spite of the influence of Greek models, the Romans never fully adopted the principle of a harmonious and proportioned education of all the faculties. In early days the aim of physical training at Rome had been simply to equip men for war, not as at Athens to develop bodily health, beauty and grace. Accordingly, though the exercises of the *palaestra* were introduced at Rome, conservative fathers disapproved. The exercises outraged Roman feelings of decorum, for, as Ennius expresses it,

Physical  
training.

‘*Flagiti principium est nudare inter ciues corpora*’.

(Cic. *Tusc.* iv 70.)

The *palaestra* was also regarded as encouraging idleness, and as dangerous to morals. The dislike to Greek gymnastic often found expression—even down to the age of Tacitus (*Ann.* xiv 20).

277. Dancing and music now began to receive a certain amount of recognition. Both were taught to boys and girls of good birth, but never formed an essential part of education.

Dancing and  
music.

They were looked upon as entertainments, where amusement was supplied by paid performers. Dancing, in particular, was denounced as disgraceful for a Roman. Cicero, for example, says (*pro Mur.* 13) ‘*Nemo enim fere saltat sobrius, nisi forte insanit*’; and Sallust (*Cat.* 25) ‘*Psallere, saltare elegantius quam necesse est probae*’. Nepos (*Epam.* 1 f) contrasts the Roman and the Greek attitude towards music and dancing.

278. In the first century B.C. Roman education stands forth transformed on Greek models. How great the transformation was may be seen if Cato’s list of subjects of training (§ 274)

Third period,  
c. 100 B.C.—  
100 A.D.

is compared with Varro’s, which comprises grammar, dialectic, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, music, medicine, architecture. For the system of education from 100 B.C. to 100 A.D. we have many contemporary authorities, which enable us to

picture it with some completeness, as regards at least the children of the richer classes.

279. The child was very soon brought under Greek influence, for his nurse was often a Greek. The foreign nurse was not always Greek nurses. approved of (Tacitus, *Dial.* 29). Complaints were also made that the sturdy training to endure hardships in preparation for warfare was disappearing before Hellenic effeminacy; that the youth could not stick on the saddle, and was afraid to hunt, for he was a greater adept at 'trundling the Grecian hoop and throwing the dice' (Hor. *Odes* iii 24, 54 f). From about the age of seven to the age of sixteen the boy was attended by a *paedagōgus*, who looked after his manners and morals, and taught him to speak Greek. This attendant slave, also known as *pedisequus*, *custos*, *comes*, and *rector*, became necessary when schools arose and when parents desired their children instructed in conversational Greek. The *paedagogus* rarely left his charge; he accompanied the boy to school, and waited there. To aid the constant supervision, Augustus reserved for the *paedagogi* special seats in the theatre, close to where the boys sat.

280. The school was called *ludus*, and, in classical Latin, that word continued to be the only designation for the elementary school. Higher schools came in time to be termed *scholae*. Schools and school-buildings. \* At first and for many years no special buildings were used as schools. The school-room was regularly called *taberna* or *pergŭla*, which indicates that the *ludi magister* taught at first in any odd corner, a room on the ground floor open to the street, a lean-to, or a verandah. In later days we find *pergulae magistrales* denoting lecture-rooms. The furniture was not elaborate. The pupils, arranged in classes, if the school was large, sat on benches; they rose to recite, and, when writing, held their tablets on their knees. The master, at least in schools of grammar and rhetoric, occupied a *cathēdra* on a platform, *pulpitum*, while a *sella* was placed on the floor for his assistant, *hypodidascalus*, *subdoctor*, *adiutor*. Maps and chronological tables existed, but their use in school cannot be proved for this period. The *Tabula Iliaca*, now in the Capitoline Museum, is part of a series of Homeric scenes. In the schools of literature, busts of famous authors were displayed; and some interpreters hold that this is referred to by Juvenal in the lines (VII 226 f):—

‘Cum totus decolor esset  
Flaccus, et haereret nigro fuligo Maroni’.

Others, however, explain the passage as meaning school-books blackened with smoke from the pupils' lanterns.

281. Lanterns were often necessary, for school began early. Sometimes even before cockcrow the boy set out with his *paedagogus*, and, if his parents were wealthy, with a *capsarius*, a

School hours.

slave bearing the *capsa* full of books, and the writing-tablets. Many a boy, however, had no *capsarius*, and carried his own bag, as Horace says of the centurions' sons (*Sat.* i 6, 74),

'Laevo suspensi loculos tabulamque lacerto'.

On his early walk to school the boy might buy a morsel of bread from a baker. He went home for *prandium*, and then returned to school. The length of the school-day is not exactly known.

282. The harsh discipline of the Roman schools, both elementary and secondary, is proverbial. Plautus (*Bacch.* 433 f) supplies evidence from the previous period :—

Discipline.

'Cum librum legeres, si unam peccauisses syllabam,  
Fieret corium tam maculosum quamst nutricis pallium'.

The regular instrument of corporal punishment was the cane, *fērŭla*, *uirga*, applied to the hand. More severe was a whipping with the *scŭtica*, applied, as appears in a fresco of Herculaneum, to the bare back. Horace's *plāgosus Orbilius* is universally known, the *grammaticus* about whom Suetonius (*de Gram.* 9) quotes the line,

'Si quos Orbilius ferula scuticaque cecidit'.

All teachers were not so cruel; and Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.* i 3, 14 f), like Plutarch (*de Educ. Liberis*, xii), denounced corporal punishment as degrading and futile. Rewards are seldom mentioned. M. Verrius Flaccus (*Suet. de Gram.* 17), instituted competitions in which the *uictor* received a prize :—'*id erat liber aliquis antiquus, pulcher aut rarior*'.

283. The *litterator*, the *grammaticus*, and the *rhetor* were paid monthly; and the amount varied with the time, the place, and the teacher's status. The pay of the *magister ludi litterarii* was never high, for his qualifications were small. Horace says that, in his native town, each pupil paid eight *asses* monthly,

Remuneration  
of teachers.

'Ibant octonos referentes Idibus aeris'.

(*Sat.* i 6, 75.)

Much later, in the days of Diocletian, the maximum monthly fee from each pupil was fixed at fifty *denarii* for the *litterator*, two hundred for the *grammaticus*, and two hundred and fifty for the *rhetor*. Clever teachers of literature and of rhetoric could always make large incomes. The *grammaticus*, Q. Remmius Palaemon, drew from his school 400,000 sesterces a year. Vespasian fixed the State-salary of rhetoricians at 100,000 sesterces. As a rule, however, since anyone might open a school, fees were lowered by competition. Sometimes the teacher contracted with the parents for a yearly payment, or left it to their generosity. In addition to any fixed sum, gifts were presented to the teacher at stated seasons—the *Minervale munus* at the *Quinquātrus*, the *sportŭla Sāturnalicia* at the *Saturnalia*,

the *strena Kalendaria* on the first of January, and other gifts at the dates known as *Cara Cognatio* and *Septimontium*.

284. Holidays appear to have been numerous. School was closed at the *Quinquātrus*, at the *Saturnalia*, on the market days, *Holidays.* *nundinae*, and probably on such festivals as those of Flora, Victoria, Ceres and Apollo. Triumphs and gladiatorial shows occasioned incidental holidays. During the intense heat of summer when school-work was inconvenient and dangerous, and when in the country boys were required on the harvest-field and in the vineyard, there was a long vacation. The exact length is uncertain. One view is that holidays extended from the Ides of June to the Ides of October—a view based on passages from Martial and Horace. The former (*Epig.* x 62, 6 f), writing under the scorching heat of July, bids the *ferulae* sleep till the Ides of October,

‘Aestate pueri si ualent, satis discunt’.

The Horatian passage is

‘Ibant octonis referentes Idibus aera’,

the variant reading of *Sat.* i 6, 75, quoted above.

285. Whether boys and girls were taught together or separately must be left doubtful. Perhaps in some localities, and at certain times, they received instruction together. A Capuan school-master is portrayed on his tomb with a boy on one side and a girl on the other. But that may simply indicate that boys and girls were taught by the same master, not necessarily at the same time: an interpretation which the other evidence may also bear.

286. Seven was the usual age for pupils to go to the elementary school: but, as Quintilian recommended, some children began at an earlier age to learn letters at home. Five years were spent on the elementary subjects—reading, writing, and calculation. When learning the alphabet, the boy was often allowed to play with ivory letters or coaxed by *crustula*, pastry. He was drilled in correct pronunciation of syllables, and in accurate reading. Sometimes

*Reading.* formal instruction began sooner in Greek than in Latin, a practice approved by Quintilian. The pupil was set to write the letters soon after he started to learn them. With a *stilus* he

*Writing.* followed the shape of the letters, sometimes traced on wax, sometimes cut out on a wooden board. If necessary, his hand was guided by the master's. Next, he imitated copies, which were commonly wise maxims useful for storing in the memory. Seldom, and only late, do we hear of children writing with ink on paper. The master dictated a great deal, usually proverbs and selections from good literature. These had to be assiduously committed to memory, for the cultivation of the memory played a great part in Roman education. As the notation was complicated and hard to comprehend, the teaching of calculation was sometimes



entrusted to a special master, *calculator*. Calculation might be done mentally, or on the *abacus*, or by means of the fingers. In one kind of *abacus* pebbles, *calculi*, were moved about; in another knobs were made to slide in grooves, representing different values. In finger-reckoning amounts were indicated by the finger-joints and by touching different parts of the body. Calculation.

287. At the age of twelve the boy went to the *grammaticus* to study literature, and continued there till he assumed the *toga virilis*. Greek literature was commonly studied before Latin; and Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.* i 4, 1) regarded that as the preferable course. The method of instruction was the same for both literatures. The distinction of *grammatici* as *Graeci* and *Latini* sometimes implied separate teachers and separate schools; but in many schools both literatures were studied, and often under the same master. Poetry was very thoroughly studied; there is considerable doubt whether prose was studied with equal care, but prose was either read by the pupils or dictated to them as material for composition. In Greek Homer came first. Other poets were Hesiod, the dramatists, and the lyric writers in selections. The Latin poets chiefly read were Livius Andronicus, Ennius, and other early authors, Plautus, Terence, Virgil, Horace, Lucan, Statius. Quintilian thought it best to begin with Virgil, even though at first the pupils might not comprehend him fully (*Inst. Orat.* i 8, 5). The *grammaticus* endeavoured to make his pupils so conversant with every poem studied that they could read it with correct pronunciation, with attention to punctuation, and with suitable expression; and he was himself expected to show the way, *praelegere*. Formal grammar was super-‘Secondary’  
education. officially treated in some schools, but Quintilian urged the importance of a proper foundation of grammatical knowledge. For this end the teacher might give lectures of his own compiling, or—in later days—use the text-book of Q. Remmius Palaemon. Grammar comprised instruction in the sounds, the historic changes of words, their classification, their inflexion, and in correct, clear, and elegant diction. Grammar. The *grammaticus*, however, spent most of his time in elucidating the poets. Lectures were given on metre, on poetry in general, on the special qualities of each poet studied, and on any points of history, mythology, philosophy or astronomy, which they contained. Here was ample scope for the *grammatici* to show their scholarship, and some of them thought more of displaying it than of instructing their pupils. It was fashionable to propound and to answer frivolous questions: as ‘Who was Anchises’ nurse?’ or ‘Hecuba’s mother?’ or ‘What songs did the Sirens sing?’ (*Juv.* vii 231 sqq.; *Suet. Tib.* 70). The pupils committed to memory many passages of poetry, and practised verse-making. As exercises in prose, they reproduced Elucidation of  
the poets. stories in their own words; turned poetry into prose with Composition. varying degrees of freedom; transformed in different ways apophthegms,

anecdotes, and sayings of great men; and worked into narrative the subject-matter of the poets. The boys of the school of literature had special instructors for music, dancing and geometry—including calculation. The acquirement of these is advocated by Quintilian especially on account of their utility to the orator. Pupils, who were not to proceed to the *rhetor*, often received from the *grammaticus* a training in elementary rhetoric. They thus completed 'orbis ille doctrinae quam Graeci ἐγκύκλιον παιδείαν uocant' (Quint. *Inst. Orat.* i 10, 1).

288. The crown of Roman education was rhetoric, or the art and practice of effective public speaking. It was regularly begun

Rhetoric.

after the assumption of the *toga uirilis*, though at times the preliminary parts were taught at an earlier stage by the *grammaticus*. The *rhetor* then restricted his instruction to declamation, a custom censured by Quintilian. Under the Republic, oratorical ability was of supreme importance for pleading in the law-courts and for addressing popular assemblies or the Senate. Under the Empire, this importance diminished; but the study of rhetoric continued, and it became more and more methodical.

Progymnas-  
mata.

The preliminary exercises of rhetoric, *progymnasmata*, were very elaborate. The pupils constructed narratives founded on fable, story or history; amassed arguments for or against the truth of some story, *κατασκευή, ἀνασκευή*; wrote eulogies of famous men and censures of infamous, with which they sometimes combined comparison of characters. Other exercises consisted of general remarks, *communes loci*, on vices, and of theses on such debatable points as 'Iuris periti an militaris uiri laus maior?' or 'Petendine sint magistratus?' or 'Cur armata apud Lacedaemonios Venus?' Pithy sayings, *sententiae*, were carefully discussed. If the saying was ascribed to some eminent man, the exercise was termed *chria* (*χρεία*), and the method was as follows. First came a panegyric on the author; then, the saying was paraphrased and its meaning fully brought out; next, the underlying principle of the saying was shown, and its truth proved; comparisons and contrasts followed; then, illustrations were adduced from history; quotations of similar purport were given; and the whole concluded with a practical exhortation. The most difficult of the preliminary exercises was the attacking and the defend-

Formal  
rhetoric.

ing of laws. The pupil now proceeded to study formal rhetoric; for whatever was the kind of oratory, whether *genus demonstratiuum*, eulogy or censure, or *genus deliberatiuum*, persuasion, or *genus iudiciale*, accusation or defence, the orator was expected to give good heed to five points. These five were *inuentio*, the finding of suitable matter; *dispositio*, arrangement; *elocutio*, appropriate diction; *memoria*, remembering matter, arrangement and diction; *pronuntiatio*, propriety of tone and gesture. The last and principal part

Declamatio.

of rhetorical training was *declamatio*, practice in composing orations. Cicero divided the themes into *causae*, definite cases, *i.e.* limited as to time, place, person, and circumstances generally; and *proposita*, inde-

finite, unlimited. In later days, declamations were classed as *suasoriae*, where a certain course of action was debated; and *controuersiae*, where some point was affirmed or denied. It was customary for a pupil to learn his composition by heart, and declaim it in the presence of his relatives and friends. Quintilian discouraged this practice; and recommended instead that pupils should store their memories with striking passages from illustrious orators.

289. Towards the end of the Republic, young Romans usually went abroad to study rhetoric and philosophy. The latter might be begun at Rome, but only at Athens could it be properly acquired. Cicero, Caesar, Augustus, Horace and Ovid—not to mention more—travelled in search of higher learning. Athens was the chief place of resort. Among other places were Rhodes, Mytilene, Ephesus, Pergamus, Tarsus, Smyrna, Alexandria, Apollonia, and Mas-silia.

Studying  
abroad.

290. For some three centuries after 100 A.D. Roman education continued on the same general lines as before. Apuleius (*Florida*, 20) says: 'Prima cratera litteratoris ruditatem eximit, secunda grammatici doctrina instituit, tertia rhetoris eloquentia armat'. See also Augustine, who says, 'illas primas ubi legere et scribere et numerare discitur' (*Confess.* i 13). But the increasing decay of the Empire told on the spirit of education. The *grammaticus* gradually restricted his training to preparation for the rhetorical schools; and the latter showed a change, which had been noted in the days of Tacitus. The difference between the Republic and the Empire caused rhetoric to be almost entirely disjoined from real life: it became narrow and artificial, full of glitter and smartness, but superficial and without solid foundation. Greek, formerly considered so essential, ceased to be generally taught in schools. After the second century A.D. fewer and fewer pupils pursued higher studies, till these came to be the exclusive possession of officials and professional scholars. Seneca's remark (*Ep.* 106) 'non uitae sed scholae discimus' became true in a very literal sense.

Fourth period:  
Decadence,  
c. 100—  
400 A.D.

291. Yet it was during the period of decadence that the fostering care of the authorities was strong. The 'let-alone' policy of the State gradually ceased. Julius Caesar began a change, when he gave the franchise to all teachers of liberal arts—then mostly Greeks. But Vespasian was the first to endow education by appointing for Greek and Latin professors of rhetoric a salary of 100,000 sesterces payable from the treasury. Hadrian built the *Athenaeum* at Rome for public recitations. Succeeding emperors endowed professorships, and granted teachers special privileges, such as exemption from taxes and military service. Their payment was sometimes a charge on the imperial treasury, sometimes on municipalities. Private individuals now and then gave endowments. Pliny, for instance, supplied one-third of the revenue for a municipal school at Comum (*Ep.* iv 13). Trajan undertook to provide education for 5000 children. Severus, besides build-

State-endow-  
ment and  
State-control.

ing class-rooms, established scholarships for the maintenance of poor students. As a natural result, government-endowment ended in government-control. The early emperors left the management of schools alone, but the later emperors interfered in the appointment and the remuneration of teachers. Diocletian, as we have seen above (§ 283), fixed the rate of payment for various subjects of instruction. When teachers became a privileged class, the government restricted their number. In 425 A.D. an imperial edict made the government the sole educational authority, and declared it a penal offence to open schools without permission.

292. Though music never held in Roman education the high place which it held in Greek, we may add a brief notice of the chief musical instruments known to the Romans. The general name for stringed instruments was *fides*. The most common of these, the *lyra* and the *cithära*, do not seem to have differed very much. The *lyra* had a varying number of strings, stretched along a frame, the sides of which were sometimes made of horn. Owing to the story of Mercury's invention of the *lyra*, the sounding-board was often shaped like the shell of the tortoise, *testüdo*; and *testudo* is used to denote the instrument itself. The sounds were produced by the fingers, or with a short stick or quill, *plectrum*, *pecten*. The characteristic of the *cithara* was that the whole framework served as a sounding-board. The *barbitös* and the *nablium* were varieties of the *lyra*. Other stringed instruments, akin to the harp, were the *sambüca* and the *psalterium*. The chief wind-instrument was the *tibia*—which resembled our clarinet—a pipe of bone, metal, reed or cane, with a mouth-piece, *ligüla*, and holes to regulate the sound. The player, *tibicen*, frequently used two pipes at once, either the same in tone, *tibiae pæres*, or different, *tibiae impæres*. To keep the two in position and to economize breath, the player's mouth was covered with a perforated band, which was strapped round his head. The *cornu* was a large circular trumpet, originally of horn, later of bronze; the *tüba*, a straight trumpet; and the *lituus*, straight with a curve at the large end. The *hydraulus* was an organ, in which water-power supplied the wind. We hear also of the bag-piper, *utrículärius* or *ascaules*. The *fistüla* or *härundo*, Pan's-pipes, a row of reeds gradually decreasing in size, belonged to rustic life. Of instruments for clashing or beating, the following may be mentioned—*cymbäla*, cymbals; the *crötalum*, a kind of castanet or rattle, used as an accompaniment to dancing; and the *tympänum*, which sometimes means a tambourine, sometimes probably a kettle-drum.

Grasberger, *Erziehung und Unterricht im klassischen Alterthum* (Würzburg, 3 vols. 1864—1881); Bernhardt, *Grundriss der Römischen Bibliographie. Litteratur*, pp. 35—95, 5th ed. (Braunschweig, 1872); Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, pp. 80—122, 834—847 (Leipzig, 1886); Jullien, *Les Professeurs de Littérature dans l'ancienne Rome* (Paris, 1885); Laurie, *Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education*, 2nd ed. (London, 1900); A. S. Wilkins, *Roman Education* (Cambridge, 1905); Blummer, *Privatalt.* 312—340.



## V. 10. BOOKS AND WRITING.

293. THE form in which literature was preserved and circulated during the earlier period of the history of Rome did not differ from that which prevailed in the Greek world. In this department of life, as in others, Greek influence was paramount. What has been said, therefore, about the form of Greek books and writing-implements, in the *Companion to Greek Studies*, holds good for the Roman world. The predominant form of the book was the roll; as to the material, it was long remembered by the Romans that in ancient times the bark of trees had been employed for writing upon, and had given its name, *liber*, to books in general. Linen was also in use at an early period; the Silylline books were imagined to have been *libri lintei* by some; by others, palm-leaves were thought to have been their material. These uncertain traditions are of little importance. We are primarily interested in the usages of a later time; and may confine our thoughts to the two materials of papyrus (*charta*) and parchment (*membrana* or *pergamenta*).

Liber.  
Libri lintei.

294. The manufacture of *papȳrus* was confined to Egypt. It was always an expensive commodity, both because it was produced in a very limited area, and because the process of making it was long, and entailed much skilled manual labour. It is most probable that the establishment of the great Alexandrian library led to improvements in the manufacture, and stimulated production; and we are told definitely by Pliny that further improvements were made in the first days of the Empire (*N. H.* xiii 74 f). In addition to its costliness, it had other disadvantages as a vehicle for the preservation of literature, in that it was brittle, and very liable to crack and split. Great care was required in the handling of it. On the other hand, it was eminently light and portable, and its brown-yellow colour was restful and pleasing to the eyes of dwellers in a sunny climate. Parchment, as a heavier and cheaper material, was clearly considered inferior to papyrus for a long period. A series of epigrams by Martial (xiv 183—196), intended to accompany presents sent at the season of the *Saturnalia*, furnishes evidence of this fact. The epigrams are in pairs: the first of each pair describes an expensive present; the second, one of a cheaper sort. Those which relate to gifts of books place works written in *pugillaribus membranis*, or in *membranis*, in the second category.

Papyrus.

295. We must think then of the well-to-do Roman as reading books written on rolls of papyrus. The text was inscribed in a series of columns, running of course from left to right. The reader held the roll in both hands, exposing perhaps two or three columns at a time. As he proceeded, he rolled up the finished portion

The papyrus  
roll.

with his left hand. Thus, when he had gone through the book, the beginning of the text was innermost, and the end outside; and, for the convenience of the next person who wished to read it, the roll had to be re-rolled from right to left, in order to bring the beginning to the outside once more. It has been pointed out (by Birt) that, whenever a person is represented in ancient sculptures or paintings as holding a roll in his left hand, we must understand that he has completed the reading of the book and may be about to ponder over it or to address an audience upon the subject of it; whereas, if the roll be in his right hand, we may infer that he is about to begin reading it<sup>1</sup>. From what has been said it will be evident that the form of the roll must have caused great inconvenience to anyone who desired to refer to particular passages, or to collect information from a number of different works.

Accordingly, those who were engaged in anything like literary research must have made copious use of tablets, *pugillares*, on which they transcribed from the rolls the extracts which interested them<sup>2</sup>. These tablets, which were at first commonly leaves of wood coated with wax, are, as is easily seen, the germ of the book as we now have it: the *codex* as opposed to the *uolūmen*. Already, as we have seen, in the time of Martial, late in the first Christian century, there were *pugillares*, in which the wooden leaves had been replaced by parchment, upon which literary texts were written. An inscription found at Priene, belonging to the beginning of the first century *before* Christ, makes mention apparently of *cōdices* (τεύχη) both of papyrus and of parchment, in which the public acts of the city had been transcribed; and, at Rome in 52 B.C., the *codices librariorum* formed part of the pyre which an angry mob kindled under the corpse of Clodius. These *codices* were probably transcripts of official documents, like those of Priene. But, though used for the preservation of such documents, for legal text-books, and for books to be read in schools or on journeys, the *codex* did not become fashionable until perhaps the fourth century A.D. It was the growth of the Christian community which brought it into prominence; and, with the *codex*, the material best adapted to that form, namely parchment, also came into favour. There were *codices* of papyrus; but the brittleness of that fabric, apt as it was to crack when folded, debarred it from being largely used in this form.

296. Reverting to the roll, we may note some points connected with its use, and the methods adopted for its preservation. We often find mention of the *umbilicus* (ὀμφαλός), a stick with ornamented ends, round which the volume was rolled. It has been usually assumed that this stick was permanently affixed to the end of the roll; recently, however, Birt has thrown doubt upon this, and, as it seems, with

<sup>1</sup> See Fig. 9 and Fig. 13 in J. W. Clark's *Care of Books*.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Plin. *Epp.* iii 5, 10 and 17.

good reason. According to him, the *umbilicus* was *not* attached to the roll. It could be withdrawn or inserted at pleasure. No undoubted example of an *umbilicus* exists; but it seems likely that there are remains of them in some of the carbonized rolls found at Herculaneum. Normally, the roll had nothing corresponding to a binding. Sometimes it was tied up by thongs attached to the end: Catullus (according to the manuscript text) mentions *lora rubra membranæ*<sup>1</sup>; sometimes a cylindrical case (of skin) was used, to contain a single roll. This, which was called a *paenula*, was probably, like the gilded *umbilicus*, part of the outfit of a costly presentation-copy, and was not in common use.

lora.

This, which

paenula.

297. Small sets of rolls were kept, standing vertically, in boxes commonly of a circular form, called *capsae* or *scrinia*. For larger collections bookcases (*plūtēi*, *pēgmata*) were provided. In these the rolls were laid in pigeon-holes (*nidi*, *fōrūli*, *loculamenta*). The upper end (*frons*) of the roll was exposed, and to this a title was attached (*σίλλυβος*, *σίττυβος*, *index*, *titulus*). It was written on a slip of parchment, papyrus, wood, or other material, projecting or hanging down from the roll, so as to be easily legible by the searcher after a particular book. The aspect of such a range of pigeon-holes, with a student or library-keeper engaged in taking out one of the rolls which lie therein, with the titles attached, is well given in a bas-relief (Fig. 24) discovered in the 17th century at Neumagen


capsae and  
plutei.index or  
titulus.

Fig. 24. A Roman taking down a roll from its place in a library. From Clark's *Care of Books*, p. 35; first published in C. Brower and J. Masen's *Antiquitatum Treuerensium libri xxv*, Liège, 1670 (Brinkmann, however, *Bonner Jahrb.* 114 f, p. 461, contends that the rolls are not of parchment, but of cloth).

<sup>1</sup> xxii 7, where modern texts print *lora rubra*, *membrana*, or <et> *lora*, *rubra membrana* (Postgate).

near Trèves and now unhappily lost. Book-cases protected by doors were known by the name *armarium*, a word applicable to a cupboard used for any purpose<sup>1</sup>.

298. Of writing-materials there is not much to be said. The pointed *stilus* of metal was used for writing on wax-tablets; for writing with ink the *calamus*, or reed-pen, was universally employed. A Roman bas-relief (Birt, *Buchrolle*, p. 120) shows us the scribe's outfit:—a case containing a bundle of four or five pens, an ink-bottle attached to it, a pair of tablets and a *stilus*. A principal ingredient of the ink in ordinary use appears to have been soot.

299. As to the production and sale of books in Roman times, a good deal can be gathered from literary allusions. The book-trade was a recognised one. The procedure of publishing seems to have been as follows, at the end of the first century A.D.

The author took his own corrected copy (which he had very likely introduced to the world by means of a public recitation) to the bookseller of his choice: the latter had what we should call an edition produced in his establishment, by his staff of copyists. Of the number of copies which constituted an edition we know nothing; probably it was not large. There is little, if any, evidence for the theory that the scribes wrote from dictation: it may well have been the case that the copy was cut up and distributed among a number of scribes. When the edition was ready, the names of the book and the author were advertised upon the door-posts of the bookseller's establishment. It is by no means clear that the author derived any pecuniary profits from the transaction. Nor was the copyright of a literary work the property of its author or publisher. There was nothing to prevent copies being made by private persons or by other tradesmen. It is difficult to form any comprehensive idea of the prices of books in Rome. One book of Martial's epigrams (the first) was obtainable from the bookseller Atrectus for five *denarii*; the thirteenth was sold by Trypho for one *denarius*. But the first-named appears to have been 'handsomely got up', while the latter may have been a very plain and humble production.

The public libraries of Rome were a most important feature in its literary life. The first great accumulations of books in the city were the result of conquest. Aemilius Paullus, Sulla, Lucullus, successively brought home libraries of Greek books which they had acquired as spoil. Lucullus threw open his collection to the learned of his day; but the foundation of the first actual public library in Rome was due to Asinius Pollio. Julius Caesar had contemplated a similar institution, the formation of which was entrusted to Varro. The project was frustrated by Caesar's death. Augustus founded two public libraries, one in the *Porticus Octaviae*, the other in connexion with the temple of the

<sup>1</sup> See frontispiece to the *Codex Amiatinus* in Clark's *Care of Books*, init.



Palatine Apollo<sup>1</sup>. In these the Greek and Latin libraries were kept in separate divisions of the building. The same arrangement prevailed in the magnificent *Bibliotheca Ulpia* founded by Trajan. Here the great Column sculptured with the portrayal of Trajan's conquests stood in the centre of a small court between the two sections of the library. At the beginning of the fourth century A.D. there are said to have been as many as twenty-nine public libraries in Rome: and there is evidence that they existed in provincial towns as well.

300. In conclusion, something may be said as to the illustration of ancient books by means of pictures. A few allusions to the practice are made in literature. Varro collected a large number of portraits of eminent persons, arranged them in groups of seven, and published them with short explanatory text under the title of *Hebdomades* (Plin. *N. H.* xxxv 11). Martial (xiv 186) describes a copy of Virgil as bearing a portrait of the poet at the beginning:—

Illustration of  
books.

‘Quam brevis immensum cepit membrana Maronem!  
Ipsius et uultus prima tabella gerit’.

But, though not much light on the matter can be derived from ancient writers, it seems probable that rolls containing pictures, and perhaps only pictures, without accompanying text, were not uncommon. Fragments of Egyptian rolls illustrating fables have been found in recent years, and, though we do not possess a picture-roll earlier than the ninth century in date, it has been pointed out that the pictures in the Vienna *Genesis* of the sixth century have the appearance of being taken from a roll and copied into a *codex*. Birt dwells on the fact that the arrangement of the sculptures on the Columns of Trajan and of Antoninus, in a spiral band, may be regarded as an embodiment of a picture-roll in stone.

301. Among the illustrated *codices* which have survived, a few may be named as containing pictures that recall the works of the classical period. The Vatican Virgil, the Milan Iliad, the Vienna Dioscorides, a group of early copies of Terence, a Nicander at Paris, the Wolfenbüttel copy of the works of the Roman surveyors (called the *Codex Arcerianus*), are the most remarkable among secular books, while of Christian productions the foremost are two copies of *Genesis*, one at Vienna, the other (fragmentary) in the Cottonian collection at the British Museum; a Greek Psalter at Paris; a roll illustrating the *Book of Joshua* at the Vatican; two Greek Gospel books (one at Rossano in Calabria, the other in Paris); and a number of copies of the *Psychomachia* of Prudentius, a poem describing the conflict of the Virtues with the Vices.

J. W. Clark, *The Care of Books*, ed. 2, 1902; H. Géraud, *Essai sur les Livres dans l'Antiquité*, 1840; Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, 1882, and *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst*, 1907; Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*, 1907. Bibliography.

<sup>1</sup> See ground-plan of the church of S. Maria Antiqua in lower part of the PLAN OF THE FORUM, facing p. 46.

On Libraries in the Roman world, cp. (besides J. W. Clark's *Care of Books*) Dziatzko in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *Bibliotheca*, and the literature there quoted; also R. Cagnat, *Les bibliothèques municipales*, 1906; A. Langie, *Les bibliothèques publiques* (Fribourg, Suisse), 1908; and Niemann's reconstruction of the library of Celsus at Ephesus in *Jahreshefte d. oest. arch. Inst.* 1905, Beiblatt 65. On the book-trade, cp. Blümner's *Privatalt.* 643-9.

Engravings of the illustrations in the Vatican Virgil (no. 3225) have been published by Bottari, Rome, 1741, and photographic facsimiles in *Fragmenta et picturae Virgiliani codicis Vaticani*, 1899 (two of which are reproduced in G. F. Hill's *Illustrations of School Classics*, 1903, no. 46 and no. 380). There are also facsimiles of the Vienna Dioscorides (Leiden, 1906), and the Latin Aesop (*ib.* 1905). For Terence, we have the facsimile of the Ambrosian MS, including illustrations from other MSS (*ib.* 1903); the reproductions of the 151 illustrations in the Paris MS 7899 (Paris, 1907); also the 96 illustrations from four MSS of the *Phormio* published with Karl E. Weston's article on *The Illustrated Terence MSS* in *Harvard Studies*, vol. xiv (1903); and J. van Wageningen's inexpensive *Album Terentianum*, with reproductions of all the illustrations in the Ambrosian MS and the Paris MS 7899, Groningen, 1907. R. Engelmann's *Antike Bilder aus Römischen Handschriften* (Leiden, 1909) contains 174 miscellaneous reproductions from illustrated MSS.

## VI. PUBLIC ANTIQUITIES.

### VI. I. THE ROMAN CONSTITUTION

302. To give any brief connected exposition of the Roman constitution is a difficult task. The nature of the fully developed political institutions of Rome cannot be well understood, unless the course of their development is known, at least in outline. For the marked peculiarity of Roman constitutional history is its unbroken evolution, whereby a mode of government which originally sprang up in connexion with a small town community was gradually adapted for the direction of a widespread empire. No violent breach of continuity is to be found in the whole course of the changes which passed over the political existence of Rome from the dawn of its history to its latest phases. But it would be impossible, while tracing the growth of the institutions, to give in all cases a sufficient account of the forms they took when they had attained maturity. The needs of the majority of students for whom this volume is designed will be best met by adopting a method which is composed of two elements, the historical and the expository, of which the former is the more important.

The unbroken evolution of Roman constitutional history.

303. The Roman government at all times was based on a certain conception of authority which resembles nothing that is to be found in the constitutional history of any other people. The supreme magistrate or magistrates of the community were invested with 'the right to command', which was denoted by 'imperium', and disobedience in the citizen was treason. This imperium was regarded as in its nature and origin absolute and unlimited. The legendary history of the Monarchy assumed that the imperium of the kings was in fact unfettered. The word could also be applied to the power exercised by the head of a family over those subjected to him, and this power was supposed to have been in the earliest days, like that of the king, unbounded. The power of the paterfamilias was gradually impaired by the growing power of the State. The imperium of the chief magistrate was subjected to control during the Republican period, with one interlude of uncontrolled government under Sulla when the Republic was inclining to its fall. But the traces of the absoluteness of the imperium were only obscured, never lost. In a sense,

the imperium, though many exercised it, retained its unity. Authority may be truly said to have been put into commission by the Republic rather than split into fractions. The imperium of the king may be regarded as absolute in theory but not in practice. The imperium of the emperor was absolute in practice but not in theory until a late age. Roman ideas of imperium remained sufficiently unchanged to give a certain unity and solidarity to Roman constitutional history which no other constitutional history possesses. However unlike in some respects the Republic may have been to the Monarchy and the Empire, the saying of Mommsen is true, that the king stands in the background of the Republican history.

We have therefore to contemplate a process of evolution which plays around and affects the imperium.

304. Our first task is to consider what institutions the Roman polity may be deemed to have possessed before the Republic came into existence. We are here driven, as were the Roman antiquaries themselves, to conjectures founded on a study of the institutions of later times. One remarkable characteristic of the Roman race was obstinacy in the retention of ancient forms, though the substance covered by the forms was profoundly changed. Roman constitutional history, like Roman law, is full of make-believes, which often afford glimpses into a remote past. In this field what is popularly known as the 'method of survivals', important in every inquiry into primitive history, is of peculiar and paramount consequence.

305. The question has often been asked: 'What warrant have we for supposing that the "rex" ever existed at Rome?' The title is Italic, not specially Roman. Legend distinguished at Rome two types of 'rex'; one that of the monarch who exercised his authority in a rational and patriotic manner; the other type is a replica of the Greek despot. To the former class belong the first four of the seven kings. The last of these four, Ancus Martius, is even described by Virgil as 'rejoicing overmuch in the breezes of popular favour' (*Aen.* vi 816). In spite of Greek infiltrations, the tradition of the Roman king retains many native features. He is thoroughly 'bourgeois'; his office is not hereditary; he is hedged round by no divinity like the *διογενής βασιλεὺς* of Homer. The fifth and seventh kings, the Tarquins, are despots from Etruria. The sixth is of Etruscan origin, Servius Tullius, but he sows all the seeds of the future Roman democracy.

The story accepted by the later Romans that the Republic was created by an aristocratic upheaval against Etruscan despots has borrowed many of its details from the history of Greek States. But in its essence it is credible enough. It accounts for the odium which attached in all subsequent time to the words 'rex' and 'regnum'. The cry that a popular leader was attempting to make himself a 'rex' was fatal in many cases, from Maelius to the Gracchi and Caesar. The officer known as 'rex sacrorum' (less correctly as 'rex sacrificulus') may reasonably be regarded as the old king



stripped of all but a shadowy religious authority. It is thoroughly consonant with the genius of the Romans that they should rid themselves of the king in practice, while they pretended that they had retained him. It is also characteristic that, when the Republican constitution fell temporarily into abeyance, because the succession of supreme magistrates was accidentally broken, the transitional period should be designated as 'interregnum' and the State should fall into the hands of a series of officers who bore the title of 'interrex'. It is significant that the offices of the 'rex sacrorum' and 'interrex' were never opened to plebeians.

We may imagine the king as the chief officer of the State in three spheres; those of religion, war and justice. The right to inquire, on behalf of the community, what was the will of heaven, remained throughout the Republic a principal privilege of the chief magistrate. The Roman State had no tradition of theocracy. There were experts in things divine, but they only advised the ruler; they did not control him. That Roman life, public as well as private, was in early days saturated with religion, is shown by many late survivals. For example, the business of the Senate was bound at all times to be conducted on a consecrated site, and magistrates addressed the citizens from the 'rostra', which was technically a 'templum'. That the king himself was the commander-in-chief of the army is obvious, and he must have been in particular the director of the foot-soldiers. The Roman citizens who served in the cavalry were drawn from the privileged class, but were inferior in military importance. The Republican magistrate whose functions bring him nearest to the king is the 'dictator'. He was so thoroughly 'the master of the infantry' ('magister populi'), as opposed to the 'master of the cavalry' ('magister equitum'), that a special enactment of the assembly was needed to give him permission to mount a horse. With regard to the function of the king as chief judge little need be said. The early organisation of the great clans ('gentes') and of the family, must have withdrawn from his cognisance much that came within the purview of the Republican judges. The old constitution of the 'gens' began to fall to pieces earlier than that of the family; but our records preserve many traces of the time when it was to a great extent a self-governing unit in the State. And, down to a comparatively late period, the paterfamilias was recognised as the proper judge of crimes committed by those who were subject to him.

We must regard the period of the Monarchy as one in which little definite law existed. But in early societies custom is more powerful than law in later. The 'mos maiorum', the authority of tradition and precedent, was in every age of the Roman community more potent than that of formulated enactment. The king was probably more trammelled by tradition than the later magistrate was by law. All organised institutions in the State must have had their relations to him regulated by custom in the main. We must consider now in dim outline (for nothing else is possible) what these institutions were. We will first consider such organisations as seem to have sprung up naturally and to owe nothing to design.

306. The early ascendancy of the 'gentes' stands out conspicuously.

The members of these associations must have been at one time the only citizens, properly so called. Each of these clans had its peculiar religious cult. The members supposed themselves descended from a common mythical ancestor. They had a common burial ground, like the Attic γένος, with its *πατρῴα μνήματα*. Each 'gens' seems to have had its own proper territory, to judge from the fact that the older 'tribus rusticae' of a later time bore names which had once belonged to ancient clans. Common rights and duties bound the members of a clan together. Often a 'gens' had traditional tendencies of its own, in which it felt a pride. Thus the Claudii had an ancient aversion to the practice of adoption, while the Fabii abhorred celibacy and the exposure of infants.

Every clan was composed of a number of 'familiae'. The head of the family ruled absolutely over his descendants, his wife and his sons' wives, sons who were grafted on the family by adoption, and slaves. Those subjected to the head were unprivileged. Excepting in so far as religion and custom might protect them, their lives and possessions were held at his mercy. As time went on the functions of the State were enlarged by the disintegration of the family and the clan.

To the members of the 'gentes' or clans belonged the name 'patricii'.

Ancient Roman scholars derived the term from 'patres' as applied to senators. Whatever may have been the original connexion of 'patricii' with 'pater', this explanation is certainly wrong. The 'patres' who were senators must have been selected from the 'patres familiarum' at large, while 'patricii' applied to all who belonged to their blood. Closely linked with the patrician body were the

'clientes', 'listeners' (*cluēre*) or hereditary serfs. The relation between patricians and clients was not peculiarly Roman, but belonged to the Italic towns generally, and had many counterparts in Greek communities. It is natural to suppose that the relation had its origin in conquest. But, as in feudal times, the client-body may have been swollen by the voluntary attachment of immigrants to the great families. For this right of attachment the later lawyers had a phrase—'ius applicationis'. The duties owed by the client to his lord resembled in many respects those owed by the vassal to the lord under the feudal system, aid in war, contributions to ransom on capture, to the marriage portion of the daughter, and so on. A special title, 'patronus', was assigned to the head of the family as lord of the clients; and the phrase 'matrona' must obviously have corresponded to it at the outset. The 'libertus' or freed slave was bound to similar service, and the title 'patronus' applied to the head of the family in this connexion also. Whether there were clients who were tied to the 'gens' as a whole and not to the individual families, is not clear, though the story of Attus Clausus mentions such. Both clients and slaves participated in the family 'sacra'. With the rapid decay of the patrician body during the later centuries of the Republic, the 'clientes', properly so

called, disappeared. The 'cliens' with whom we meet in Juvenal and Martial has nothing in common with the early 'cliens' excepting the name.

307. Patricians and clients together were sharply opposed to another body in the community, the 'plebs' (or 'multitude'). A similar class existed in other Italic towns. The plebeians were probably of mixed origin. Some may have come from towns which Rome conquered, whose inhabitants were removed to Roman territory. Others would certainly be descendants of the class whom the Greeks called *μέτοικοι*, foreign settlers whose privileges at Rome varied according to the treaty conditions which existed between Rome and other States. Exiles who harboured at Rome would often be received there into the body politic, but often not. The manumitted slaves of plebeian residents would contribute to the growth of the class. One thing is clear, that the plebeian body, as a whole, was alien to the religion of the patrician class. Some divinities, Diana who dwelt on the Aventine hill, and Ceres and Liber near her, were distinctly plebeian at first and were only recognised by the State in later time. To the early patricians the plebeians were profane men; and to admit them to any share of privilege was to flout the ancestral gods. Even in the beginning of the third century B.C. the patrician matrons refused to allow the plebeian ladies to participate in the worship of Pudicitia, whereupon the plebeians established a cult of the goddess for themselves, under the name of Pudicitia plebeia.

The plebs.

308. To the patricians alone belonged membership of the three original tribes, which (to name them in their official order) were called Tities, Ramnes, Lūcēres. Ancient and modern scholars alike have generally supposed them to represent different ethnic elements, which had come together into union. That a tribal division in ancient States often had such an origin is certain. But it is equally sure that the division often existed where no such explanation is possible. Fortunately, the question of origin has no significance for our particular subject. The latest speculation concerning these tribal names makes them all Etruscan. The important point is that this tribe organisation had a special connexion with the cavalry service of the army, and from it sprang the body of 'equites' who play so great a part in the political history of the later Republic. Officers called 'tribuni celerum' existed in the Republican time; their functions were religious, and connected with the walled defences of the city. At some time before the fall of the Monarchy, the scope of these tribes was enlarged, and new families were admitted, perhaps under the pressure of military necessity. Each tribe then comprised two groups, distinguished as 'priorēs' and 'posteriores', or as 'primi' and 'secundi'. We also find mention of a distinction between patrician families as 'minores gentes' and 'maiores'. It is probable, but not certain, that this division corresponded with the duplication of the original tribes.

The three original tribes.

309. The patricians were also divided in accordance with the 'curia', which was a territorial district, and has all the appearance of The curiae. having originated in a definite act of legislation. Roman antiquaries, following a common fancy of ancient days, imagined precise numerical relations as connecting together the 'tribus', the 'curia' and the 'gens'. Each tribe was supposed to contain the citizens dwelling in 10 curiae, and each curia to comprise 30 gentes. The original army consisted, according to this arrangement, of 3000 infantry and 300 cavalry, supplied in equal portions by the three tribes. This force, the whole of the original army, was the prototype of the later legion. That the curiae were concerned with an ancient form of army organisation is shown by the fact that the 'comitia curiata', even in later Republican time, was the source of the imperium, particularly on its military side. It was bestowed by a 'lex curiata'. Like all early Roman institutions the curiae had a close connexion with religion. In the legendary history of the Monarchy, the members of the curiae in their assembly, the 'comitia curiata', had the right to elect the king when the throne was vacant. That the past and present warriors of the community should have a voice in the selection of their commander seems natural enough, and we are reminded of the Germanic tribes who sometimes raised a new chief aloft on their shields. We are also told that the king, of his grace, would sometimes allow this assembly to try a man accused of treason, 'perduellio'. The name indicates primarily a military offence, and, if the 'comitia' represented the army, we can find analogies in the early history of other Indo-Germanic peoples. But it is possible that legend has attached to the older assembly of the curiae features borrowed from the later assembly of the centuries, which early replaced it as an organisation connected with the army.

310. The name of the Senate implies that it was, in its origin, an assembly of elders, like the Greek assemblies denoted by The Senate. *γερονσία*. Tradition represented the Senate as having been created by Romulus, who selected at will 100 of his followers, the Ramnes. The belief was general that the Senate in its earliest days numbered 100 members, and this number seems to have been regular from the first in the Senates of Italic towns. It was supposed that, when the Titius and the Luceres joined the community, each tribe supplied its hundred members, and till a late time the normal strength of the Senate was presumed to be 300. The institution had of course its counterpart in every ancient city, but at Rome it bears a particular stamp, in that it exemplifies a feeling which was thoroughly characteristic of the Roman mind, the feeling that in all business of importance, public or private, the agent must seek advice of those best qualified to give it, if he does not wish to fly in the face of general opinion. The Senate was at first a body freely summoned by the chief magistrate, of which he sought counsel that he might or might not follow. Such was the theory. But the magistrate, both in his choice of counsellors, and in his liberty to reject their advice,



must have been at all times greatly circumscribed by custom. In the Republican age his advisers came to be selected for him in accordance with express law. But the later Senate retained many marks of early antiquity. One of its names was 'consilium', that is, a body of advisers. This same term was applied to a jury in a criminal court, who, in the first instance, were regarded merely as counsellors of the judge; also to any group whose aid in arriving at decisions was sought by a civil magistrate, or a general on service, or a provincial governor, and also to the gathering of friends called in to assist a 'paterfamilias' in the exercise of his nominally absolute authority. A decree of the later Senate, addressed to a magistrate, always called upon him to take a particular course 'if it seemed good to him', 'si ei uideretur', and the decree was designated 'advice given by the Senate', 'Senatus consultum'. (The phrase 'Senatus decretum' is of later origin, for 'decretum' properly means the decision of a magistrate, and could only be applied to resolutions of the Senate after they had become in practice operative, though in theory still advisory.)

311. Certain offices, religious and secular, were believed to have survived into the Republican from the monarchical age. It is only necessary to mention in passing the great religious colleges, those of augurs, pontifices, and guardians of the Sibylline books. The interpenetration of secular life by religion gave the two older bodies, the augurs and the pontiffs, great influence in the conduct of government and the development of the constitution. The third body supervised the immigration into the community of foreign, particularly Greek, cults. There were minor priests of less importance, such as the flamens and haruspices, the latter being merely technical experts in the Etruscan mode of inquiring about the will of heaven, by the inspection of the entrails of the sacrificial victims, as opposed to the genuine Roman and Italian method, that of watching the behaviour of birds. Each curia had an officer called 'curio' and there was a chief 'curio' called 'curio maximus'. The principal military subordinate of the king, the 'tribunus celerum', has come before us already. The king's civil representative in his absence from the city was the 'praefectus urbi', and this officer had a successor even down into imperial times. When cases of flagrant murder needed investigation, the king was assisted by two 'quaestores parricidii'. The assistants of the consuls retained the title 'quaestores' with far different functions. From time to time two men were nominated, called 'duoviri perduellionis', to aid the king in inquiries about treason, and these officers survived into the Republican age.

Survival  
of ancient  
offices.

312. Two revolutionary creations are attributed to Servius Tullius. He was deemed the author of the new tribe, which is local and not 'genetic'. He also devised that new army organisation, which developed into the assembly known to us as the 'comitia centuriata'. The two new institutions were doubtless closely

The new  
tribes.

connected. As the old army was based upon the curia, which was a local district, so the new army was based upon the new territorial tribe. The change was probably made under the pressure of some great military crisis, which required the admission to service in the army of a lower class. Ancient tradition connected these innovations with the strengthening of the city's defences by the 'Servian wall' and the 'Servian agger'; but some scholars now regard the extant remains of wall and agger as of later date. Whether the new system had any political importance during the monarchical age, may be doubted. But the whole democratic evolution during Republican times had the scheme of Servius Tullius as its starting point.

The early history of the new tribe is obscure. The city comprised four divisions, the *tribus Sucusana* (or *Suburana*), *Palatina*, *Esquilina* and *Collina*. The contrast between town-districts and country-districts proved to be of great moment in later history. But, of the country-districts, we only know that the twenty-first tribe (the '*tribus Clustumina*'<sup>1</sup>) came into existence about the time of the first secession (Livy ii 21). With the extension of the '*ager Romanus*' the number of tribes rose in 241 B.C. to 35, at which point it remained. The tribal district was a unit which entered into many of the most important administrative institutions. The census was closely connected with the new centuriat organisation of the army; but the citizens were registered, along with their property, tribe by tribe. The earliest tax was directly levied on property according to the register, and was named '*tributum*'. The tribes possessed officials called '*tribuni aerarii*', who originally saw to the gathering of the exaction, to the payment of the soldiers on service, after it was introduced by Camillus at the siege of Veii, and to the return of the tax to the tax-payers, when possible, out of the booty acquired in war. All political assemblies, during the last two centuries of the Republic, were based upon the tribe. No man could be accounted a full citizen unless his name were written in the censors' register as member of a particular tribe. The distinction between the four city

*tribus*  
*urbanæ*  
and *rusticæ*.

tribes, '*tribus urbanæ*', and the remainder, the '*tribus rusticæ*', had several political applications. For example, manumitted slaves and their children could, as a rule, only be registered in the city tribes, even if qualified in other respects to be members of the rustic divisions. From time to time demagogues like Appius Claudius the censor and Sulpicius Rufus proposed to spread the '*libertini*' over the whole tribe-system, but with no permanent result. In official documents the designation of the tribe appears as an integral part of a citizen's name. This practice is older than the adoption by the Romans of the '*cognomen*' or third name, since the name of the tribe precedes the *cognomen*. Thus Cicero's technical description is

<sup>1</sup> Cic. *pro Balbo*, 57. *Crustumina* (p. 114 *supra*, under 494 B.C.) is an alternative form, but in inscriptions the abbreviation CLV. prevails over CRV. The district lay round the old Sabine town of *Crustumeria* (Livy ii 19), or *Crustumerium*.

M. Tullius M(arci) f(ilius) trib(u) Arn(iensi) Cicero. The tribe was somewhat like an English county. The satirist Lucilius was able to sketch the characteristics of the tribes one by one, just as we distinguish the Yorkshireman, the Northumbrian, the Cornishman, and so on, by their several peculiarities.

313. The fundamental principle of the original centurial organisation was to make army service depend, not only on citizen descent, but also on the holding of land within the 'Romanus ager'. The minimum qualification was the 'heredium', consisting of two 'iugera'. Those who were thus qualified were 'assidui', that is 'settled men'. The landless men were 'proletarii'. The landholders were arranged in five divisions called 'classes', according to the size of their holdings. The word 'classis' has sometimes been supposed to be of Greek origin, and indeed the whole centurial system has been thought to have been borrowed from Greek cities. But that is quite uncertain. The citizens in each of the five classes were divided into a certain number of sections, called 'centuriae'. As a section of the army, the century must at first have consisted of just 100 men. In the later system, it comprised 60, and two centuries formed a 'manipulus'. The wealthier classes supplied a proportionately larger contingent than the less wealthy, and, besides, the armour of the higher was more elaborate than that of the lower. Service in the field began at the age of 17 and ended at 45 or 46, but men were liable for the defence of the city until they were 60 years old. In the early days the man over 60 left the centurial organisation, but as its importance in affairs other than military increased, the practice was dropped. As a political organism, the 'comitia centuriata' consisted of centuries which were of course much larger than the centuries as constituted for military service. These 'centuriae' in the first class numbered 80; in the second, third and fourth 20 each; in the fifth 30. In historic times, these centuries were divided into equal numbers of 'iuniores' (the men below 45) and 'seniores' (above 45). Thus age was regarded, as well as wealth. The unclassified men were 'proletarii' or 'aerarii'. These were called on to perform menial service on land or at sea. The term 'classis' was sometimes used of the first class *par excellence*, as by far the most important of the five.

The  
centurial  
organisation.

Possibly, in the original scheme, property closely connected with land, as slaves and cattle, was taken into account as well as land. But other possessions were not brought within the purview of the organisation until later, when the value of a man's whole wealth came to be expressed in money. In the middle Republican period, the qualification for the first class was fixed at 100,000 *asses*; for the second at 75,000; for the third at 50,000; for the fourth at 25,000; for the fifth it is variously given as 12,500 and 11,000. As time went on, service in the legion, which was in the earlier age regarded as a privilege, was gradually extended to poorer men, until Marius abolished the pecuniary qualification altogether. We

must suppose that those who were thus brought within the 'classes' for military purposes came also within them where civil affairs were concerned.

**314.** It remains to describe the position of the cavalry in the new organisation. The history of the body to whom the name 'equites' belonged is particularly obscure, not only in the earlier but in the later stages. The ancients were agreed that in the earlier centurial system, the 'equites' numbered 1800 and that to them were allotted 18 centuries. The qualification was that required for the infantry of the first class. Whether the connexion of the cavalry with the three 'genetic' tribes survived at all the creation of the Servian scheme, cannot be determined. But, at a comparatively early time, the 'equites' were drawn from the first class, and when their service was ended, they surrendered the 'publicus equus' which had been assigned to them by the State, and maintained at the cost of the State, and lapsed into the first class again. The native Roman cavalry seems never to have been very efficient. The tendency to employ allies for this service began early, and no genuine Roman cavalry force existed after the Numantine war. How the 300 'equites' of the original Rome expanded into the 1800 of a later time was not really known to the ancients. The stories which account for it are legendary and contradictory. All that can be said is that it possibly came about through successive enlargements of the community, such as the unification of separate settlements on the Palatine and Quirinal, and the inclusion of other quarters within the city bounds later.

**315.** This classification of the citizens and allotment of their burdens in accordance with their wealth, has of course analogies in the history of Athens and other Greek States. The scheme is sometimes called by the Greek term 'timocratic'. To what extent, if any, the new army scheme carried with it at first an extension of privileges outside the military sphere, cannot be determined. The institution of a 'timocracy' in a Greek city aimed definitely at a shifting of the distribution of power among different classes of the community. That the aim of the centurial system was at the first overwhelmingly military, is certain. Even when the scheme was applied to political life, it retained many traces of its military origin. In later times, when the 'comitia centuriata' was summoned, it met in the 'plain of Mars' ('campus Martius'); it was called together by the voice of the trumpet and the members were described as 'exercitus'. When the red flag which was hoisted on the outpost of the Janiculum was hauled down, it was taken as a sign of Etruscan invasion and the business was stopped. By a tricky application of this old practice, Rabinus, tried for 'perduellio' in 63 B.C., escaped condemnation. One other question must be touched upon. Did the new system admit plebeians to military service for the first time? In other words, did the old curial army include plebeians? It seems most probable that plebeians were not reckoned as members of

Aim of  
the centurial  
system.



a curia in the time of the Monarchy, and that the local tribe was invented for the purpose of preventing the enlargement of the curia and the contamination of the 'sacra' connected with it by contact with the plebeian. Later, when the curia lost all but formal importance, the barrier was broken down and its former existence was forgotten. But more than a century and a half passed after the admission of plebeians to the consulship, and nearly a century after their admission to the ancient priesthoods, before any man of plebeian birth held the office of 'curio maximus'.

316. The revolution which overturned the Monarchy was apparently of an aristocratic rather than a popular character. It overthrew a foreign domination. In accordance with Roman custom, the changes made were the smallest possible in the circumstances, and ancient forms were preserved, so far as they could be, by fictions. Only three principles were introduced which were novel. In the first place the tenure of all magistracies was limited to a year. But it was pretended that magistrates were elected without restriction of time, and that they resigned voluntarily at the end of the year ('magistratu se abdicare'). Next, the chief magistracy was placed in the hands of two men jointly, who were 'collegae'. The title 'praetor' was given to it in the first instance, as is indicated by the fact that in a Roman army, the quarters of the general retained the name 'praetorium'. This characteristic of 'collegiality' remained normal for Republican magistracies. As a consequence the right of veto, whereby a magistrate could bar the action of one equal or inferior in authority to himself, dominated the whole Republican system. All offices were classified under the heads of 'par, maior, minor potestas'. An appeal by a citizen from one magistrate to another is 'appellatio'.

The overthrow of the monarchy.

Three new principles:  
(1) limitation of tenure,  
(2) joint tenure of office,

The third change which the Republic brought about was an enlargement of the powers of the centuriat organisation, which now started on a great political career. It became the chief electoral body and the chief legislative body of the community, and received the right to decide on war and peace, to sanction treaties, to bestow the citizenship and to try citizens for criminal offences, brought before it by appeal from the sentence of a magistrate. An appeal of this kind is 'prouocatio', and the constitutional right to it was conferred by the first 'lex Valeria de prouocatione', but the right was valid at first only within the 'pomoerium'.

(3) political powers assigned to the centuries.

317. It will be convenient here to draw attention to some peculiarities of the Roman public assemblies. In the first place, voting was by groups, not by heads. In the 'comitia curiata' the voting unit was the curia, in the 'comitia centuriata' the century, in the later 'comitia tributa' and 'concilium plebis' the tribe. Voting by heads only took place within the unit-group. Again,

Peculiarities of Roman public assemblies.

the Roman assembly had no power of initiative, none of criticism and none of amendment. It could only say 'yes' or 'no' to a question addressed to it by a magistrate, and was bound to accept or reject *in toto* his proposition, however complicated it might be. There was no essential distinction in character between the electoral, legislative and judicial pronouncements of an assembly. The legislator was said 'rogare legem'. An affirmative answer was given by a voter in the form 'uti rogas'; a negative by the word 'antiquo' ('I approve the former things'). A bill put before the voters is 'rogatio', and when carried it is a 'lex', or a 'plebiscitum' (§ 335), as the case may be. To impose a fine by vote of an assembly is 'irrogare multam'. To annul a law is 'ab-rogare', to annul it in part 'de-rogare', to replace it in part 'ob-rogare'. To vote is 'suffragium ferre' (not 'suffragari').

The proposer of a law would address the voters in support of it ('suadere legem'), and others might be allowed to speak for or against it. But otherwise no individual voter could speak. Hence the Roman assembly is very far different from the Athenian Ecclesia and Greek assemblies generally of the historic age. Cicero ridicules the levity of the Greeks, who allowed, and indeed invited, debate among the voters, so that a sudden gust of oratorical passion would lead to the passing in a moment of a decree by the show of outstretched hands. When we say (as we truly may) that the Roman assemblies eventually became sovereign, and that the later Republican constitution was, in theory, one of absolute democracy, we must not forget the practical restrictions which custom imposed. Besides those already mentioned, others will come into view as we proceed.

318. A remarkable example of the Roman unwillingness to break formally and completely with the past is afforded by the fact that throughout the Republican period, magistrates (excepting the censors and the plebeian magistrates) did not receive their authority to act from the assembly which elected them. That authority was dependent on the passing of a resolution by the oldest assembly, the 'comitia curiata'. The 'lex curiata de imperio' was annually enacted, and rapidly became a mere formality. In the Ciceronian age, only magistrates and beadles ('lictors') attended meetings of the curiae. With slight exceptions, the passing of this 'lex curiata' was the only function which was left for this shadowy survival of the most ancient Roman assembly. It is certain that, for some time after the creation of the Republic, both elections and legislation were subject to patrician sanction. Some scholars have supposed that this sanction was expressed through the 'comitia curiata'. The technical term for it was 'patrum auctoritas', and the phrase 'patres auctores fiunt' is common in the early books of Livy. The most probable view is that so long as the Senate remained purely patrician, the 'patrum auctoritas' was given by a vote of that whole body. We must return to

Retention of  
ancient  
customs.

this difficult subject when we speak of the admission of plebeians to a share in the government. Meanwhile it is only necessary to remark that the view of some ancients and many moderns, that plebeians found their way into the Senate as soon as the Republic was created, appears unacceptable.

319. The Roman regard for 'grauitas', the habit of obedience to authority, and the nature of the imperium, which was unlimited, except in so far as it was restrained by definite law, or recognised custom, induced a marked difference between Greek and Roman popular institutions. It is also important to note that the 'right of public meeting' did not exist in the Roman world. The citizens could only be called together by a magistrate, whether in the loose order which was named 'contio', when no resolution was to be taken, or in the organised meeting to which the name 'comitia' belonged, when the voters were invited to give a decision. No one but a magistrate could address a public meeting, excepting those who were authorised (or sometimes compelled) to do so by a magistrate. Ancient writers asserted that, when the Republic was founded, the quality of the imperium was not impaired, but that it remained 'royal' in character (Cic. *De Rep.* ii 56; Livy ii 1). The only formal and regular restriction placed upon it was imposed by the 'lex Valeria de prouocatione'. But the practical working of the new constitution of necessity reduced the value of the imperium to its holder. The mere fact that it was exercised by a commission of two affected it. Still more important was the increased potency of the great advisory body, the Senate, which included the older statesmen of long official experience, whose voice was bound to be of more avail in practice than that of the actual magistrates, invested as they were with an authority of short duration, and being usually younger men. It would, in general, be useless for the magistrate to place any question before the assembled citizens without securing the approval of the Senate. That body alone could effectively deliberate on public affairs. The speeches addressed to the 'contio', whether a meeting of the comitia was to follow it or not, were not delivered in a real debate. The position of the chief magistrates in the presence of the Senate was one of theoretical ascendancy, but practical subjection. In theory the Senate remained the advisory body whose advice the magistrate might ask or not, and might follow or not as he pleased. The Senate could not meet unless summoned by him. Only such business as he chose to lay before it ('*referre ad senatum*') could be the subject of a vote, and no vote could be taken at all against his will. Yet, as time went on, the supremacy of the Senate over the magistrate became more and more assured.

Some characteristics of Roman institutions.

320. The position of the consul (or rather praetor) was affected by the existence of the office of dictator. The early history of the office is obscure. The Roman writers supposed it to have come into existence some years after the expulsion of the kings.

The dictator.

There is some reason to think that it may have been an integral part of the Republican constitution from the first, whereby provision was made for evading some evils to which the dual magistracy was certain to give rise. The name 'dictator' was attached to offices in some other Italic States, but little is known of their history. At the end of the Republican time there was a dictator at Lanuvium, whose functions were chiefly religious. It is possible that the dictatorship was used to ease the transition from Monarchy to Republic. The dictator was appointed at irregular intervals. He was nominated, not elected, and only a consul could appoint him, using certain peculiar religious rites. He held office for six months only; and nominated his subordinate officer, the 'master of the horse'. The dictator himself was 'magister populi', or 'master of the foot-soldiers'. Until 300 B.C. he was not restricted by the right of appeal, and, as his imperium was unlimited, men of all degrees in the community owed him implicit obedience. The dictatorship could be used with advantage in various emergencies; as when the two consuls were at strife, or when civil broils were afoot, or when it was expedient to place the command of the army in one man's hands, or to recall to the command an experienced general. By 300 B.C., when a new 'lex Valeria de prouocatione' established the right of appeal to the assembly against the dictator, the office had outlived most of its usefulness.

321. The next great political development was brought about by what is known as the 'First Secession' in 494, which led to the creation of the Tribune of the Plebs. The traditions concerning this change are to a great extent legendary, and are coloured by reflexions from the democratic agitations of later days. The movement cannot have been altogether a rising of the poor against the rich; but there is no reason to doubt that poverty and indebtedness contributed to it. The Roman law of debt was exceptionally severe, and the debtor often became the slave of his creditor. The law was unwritten and was in the keeping of the patrician magistrates and pontiffs. It may well be believed that hard cases were abundant. The expedient of 'Secession' seems to have implied a threat to abandon Rome and found a new community, if grievances were not redressed. The efficacy of the threat may have depended on a tide in military affairs, which compelled the State to depart for the time being from the ordinary rules of service, and to press men of low degree into the ranks. The upshot was that spokesmen of the plebeian body, bearing the name 'tribunus plebis', were henceforth to be annually elected. The name 'tribunus' seems to indicate a connexion with the office of 'tribunus militaris', which was probably, even at this early time, open to plebeians, if the consuls, who nominated to it, chose to appoint them.

It is not improbable that the 'tribuni plebis' were at first two in number, like the patrician judges, the consuls. As these magistrates

The 'First  
Secession'  
and the  
tribuni  
plebis.



had two quaestors for assistants, so were two 'aediles plebis' elected to aid the new officers. The title 'aedilis' points to a special connexion with the 'aedes' of Diana on the Aventine, the chief religious rallying point of the plebeian body. The tribunes were increased in number first to five and then to ten, but there were no more than two plebeian aediles.

322. The original function of the tribune was to render aid to the oppressed plebeian; and he was said to possess 'ius auxilii'. What were the limits of this power to aid, in the first period, cannot be determined, but it must be supposed that some compact was framed in which the bounds were indicated. This question is closely connected with that of the origin of the personal inviolability of the tribunes, who were 'sacrosancti'; and their office was deemed 'sacrosancta potestas'. Two views were held in ancient times; one that the compact between the plebeians and the rulers of the State took the form of a 'foedus' or treaty, which was always regarded as 'sacrosanctum', and that therefore the privileges of the tribunes, guaranteed to them by the treaty, made their persons inviolable. Though this explanation is unsatisfactory, it is less so than the other, which assumes that the plebeians took an oath to treat as accursed any one who offered violence to the person of a tribune. They thus imitated the vague punishment attached to many crimes in early times: 'sacer esto', 'let him be accursed', which was supposed to make killing the offender a service to the gods. This oath was the first 'lex sacrata', and this phrase, says Mommsen, was a specious name for 'revolutionary self-help'. That the seceders should have been content with this performance and have returned without guarantees from the patrician rulers, is inconceivable. But the question is of slight importance, as little more than forty years later, certain 'leges sacratae' which protected the tribunes and (at the outset) the plebeian aediles were, as we shall see, incorporated in the constitution.

Their  
ius auxilii.

Their  
sacrosancta  
potestas.

323. A question, equally of small importance, which is also equally obscure, is what method of election was adopted for the tribunes and aediles. The conflicting assertions of ancient writers have led to various views, as that the electing body was the 'comitia curiata', the 'comitia centuriata', or a new plebeian gathering on the tribe-basis. But these doubts only apply to a period of about 22 years. In 471 B.C. the 'lex Publilia Voleronis' was passed, in accordance with which the tribunes were elected by what was in a strict sense a 'concilium plebis', that is to say, a gathering of plebeians alone, voting by tribes, with a plebeian tribune as president. The development of the powers of this assembly, particularly as a legislative body, is very hard to trace, and we must recur to the subject later. Mommsen holds that Volero's law started on its career the 'comitia tributa', an assembly on the tribe-basis, comprising all citizens alike, and summoned by the patrician chief magistrates. That this body, able under certain conditions

Mode of  
election.

to frame laws for the whole community, existed from 449 onwards is certain, so that the question raised by Mommsen is of no great moment.

324. The tradition concerning the movement which gave birth to the Decemvirate is encumbered with legend, much of it being of late origin. The establishment of the Decemvirs was attributed to a *lex Licinia*, passed by the 'concilium plebis', to which the patrician governors of the State lent their sanction. The function of these new officers was not to codify the whole unwritten law, which had hitherto been a sacred arcanum in the breasts of patrician priests and magistrates, but to define in writing such portions of it as had been matters of contention between patricians and plebeians. Such definition would constitute a limitation of the imperium of the chief magistrates who administered the law. That economic distress was one of the chief impelling causes of this, as of later Roman revolutions, cannot reasonably be doubted, even if we reject picturesque details, such as surround the figures of Sp. Cassius with his '*lex agraria*', and Sp. Maelius, the demagogue who was done to death for trying to make himself a '*rex*'. That economic causes stimulated political revolution in early societies is attested by the history of many ancient States. Whether the establishment of a body of ten rulers, annually changing, was at first intended to be permanent, as Niebuhr supposed, and as some ancient writers assume, is impossible to determine. The general drift of ancient tradition concerning the Decemvirate treats it as a temporary expedient, to bring about a codification of the law, and this seems the more probable opinion. Why men appointed for such a purpose should go out of office at the end of a year, is not easy to understand, and this part of the story is most likely unhistorical. While Decemvirs existed, appointments to the consulship, tribuneship, aedileship, and probably to the dictatorship and other offices, were suspended. The Decemvirs were not subjected to '*prouocatio*'. It is intelligible that they should have been given the imperium with undiminished force, to enable them to override recalcitrant sections in the community.

325. Fragments of the code of law, the '*Twelve Tables*', which the Decemvirs framed, have been preserved for us by ancient writers. In recent years, attempts have been made to show that no such code could have been drawn up earlier than 312 B.C., but nothing has been proved beyond a certain amount of re-editing. The extent of even this has been exaggerated by the critics. We are here dealing only with the political aspects of the code. It is mainly concerned with private law and religious custom, and this part of the code only affected political privilege in an indirect manner. But some provisions were of great constitutional importance, and must have struck at evils previously felt in the body politic. This is the case with the prohibition of all enactments directed against individual citizens: '*pruilegia ne irroganto*'. This may have been aimed at votes of outlawry

The  
Decemvirate.

The '*Twelve  
Tables*'.

passed by the 'concilium plebis', such as the legends present. So with the clause which forbids a man to be tried for a penalty affecting his person or his privileges as a citizen (his 'caput') excepting in 'the greatest assembly'. 'Comitiatus maximus' is the phrase, obviously indicating the 'comitia centuriata', which could hardly have been thus designated at so late a date as 312 B.C. The clause seems to confirm the tradition which records that the plebeians had attempted to punish their patrician enemies by formal trial before the 'concilium plebis'. It further appears to re-establish 'prouocatio' and so testifies to the temporary character of the Decemvirate. These are not the only clauses which had a political significance, but the others are of less importance.

326. According to the prevalent Roman tradition, plebeians were eligible for seats on the Decemviral commission, but none obtained them in the first instance. At the second election, some of the successful candidates bore names which are only known as belonging to plebeian families. But the inference that their possessors were plebeians is questionable. Many plebeian families of the later day were descended from freedmen of patrician families of the same name which had become extinct. The incidents of the Second Secession, among which is the famous story of Verginia, are again largely legendary. The fresh start given to the constitution after the overthrow of the Decemvirs was due to the old institution of the 'interregnum', which enabled consuls to be elected anew by the centuries—a Valerius and an Horatius, old Republican names. The laws passed by them are described by Livy (iii 55). One of these condemned (probably as guilty of 'perduellio') any man who aimed at establishing in the community a magistracy not restrained by the right of appeal to the citizens in their assembly. Apparently the dictatorship was excepted, as the appointment to it was by nomination and not by election. Next, the plebeian officers were re-established and the persons of the tribunes, their aediles, and certain officers called the 'iudices decemuiri' were declared sacrosanct. The position of these officers was defined with some detail, by provisions to which the name 'lex sacrata' or 'leges sacratae' was applied, in later times. We can only conjecture who the 'iudices decemuiri' were. Possibly they were elected to aid the tribunes in their supervision of the legal administration in the interest of the plebeians. This connexion may have been broken and they may have been the direct ancestors of the 'decemuiri stlitibus iudicandis' who, at the end of the Republican time, were judges in suits where liberty and citizenship were in question, a class of cases with which the tribunes in early days must have been much concerned. The third 'Valerio-Horatian' law (the first in Livy's order) has been most obscurely recorded, and there has naturally been much controversy concerning it. According to Livy, it provided that any resolution of the purely plebeian gathering, the 'concilium plebis', was made binding on all the citizens.

The  
overthrow of  
the Decemvirs.

The Valerio-  
Horatian  
laws.

This is clearly impossible. But we must defer the consideration of the matter till we come to speak of the whole position of the different 'comitia' in the fully developed Republican system. Meanwhile we proceed to describe the evolution of the magistracies and the struggle of the plebeians for admission to them.

327. The political unrest was not allayed by the Valerio-Horatian laws. The frequent use of the dictatorship in the period that follows is a sign of continuing agitation. In 445 the lex Canuleia (a 'plebiscitum') was enacted, legalising marriage between patricians and plebeians. The same year saw an agitation for the admission of plebeians to the chief magistracy. A curious device was adopted. The Senate was authorised to declare that in any particular year not consuls but 'tribuni militares consulari potestate' should be at the head of the administration. When this took place, plebeians were eligible, but we are told that none but patricians held the office before 400. The supposition that a plebeian was successful at the first election rests on a doubtful inference from a name. But the growing power of the plebeians appears on a comparison between the years 445—400 and 399—367, after which the consular tribunate ceased to exist. The number of years in which consular tribunes were substituted for consuls is much greater in the later period than in the earlier. The normal number of the consular tribunes is hard to make out. We hear of three, six and even eight. It is possible that six, the number of the military tribunes belonging to a single legion, was regular, and that the divergent numbers in our records are erroneous. No change was made in the nature of the imperium; it was merely entrusted to a larger commission than hitherto. The power of the veto between the colleagues, and the chances of checking an inconvenient plebeian, would be thus increased. It is probable that plebeians who reached the consular tribunate were not permitted to carry out the religious duties of the chief magistrate, and it is likely that precautions were taken to prevent the election of a purely plebeian body.

328. In 443 (according to the annalistic tradition) a new office, that of censor, was created, for which patricians only were eligible. Two censors were elected by the centuries every five years, to perform some important functions which had previously belonged to the consuls, particularly the registration of the citizens and their property and the settlement of the membership of the Senate. By a lex Aemilia of 434 the censors' period of office was reduced to a year and a half; but elections still took place at intervals of five years. In 421 the number of the quaestorships was raised to four and plebeians were made eligible equally with patricians. The election was by the 'comitia tributa', an assembly of all the citizens voting by tribes. A plebeian was first elected in 409.

The 'lex  
Canuleia'.

tribuni  
militares  
consulari  
potestate.

The office  
of censor  
instituted, 444.

The quaestors  
raised to  
four, 421.



329. The next great constitutional change came in 367. But meanwhile there was much agitation due partly to political and partly to economic causes. The introduction of pay for the army, attributed to Camillus, at the time of the siege of Veii, has some constitutional importance. Also an extension of service in the cavalry to men who provided and maintained their own horses. Henceforward there were two groups of 'equites', the 'equites equo priuato' and the 'equites equo publico'. The distress among the poor is illustrated by the history of C. Manlius Capitolinus, who died, even as Spurius Cassius and Maelius. The revolution of 367 was immediately preceded by a noteworthy event, the nomination of a plebeian to be 'magister equitum'. Apparently the dictator nominated without any authorisation by statute.

Constitutional agitation prior to the Licinio-Sextian laws of 368.

330. After a long agitation the laws ('plebiscita') of Licinius and Sextius were accepted. The supreme magistracy was opened to plebeians, and the title 'consul' was attached to it. The old denomination of praetor was bestowed on a third officer who was always to be patrician and was to be chief administrator of the law. Technically, the rule of collegiality was not broken by the new creation; for Roman antiquaries declared that the praetor was theoretically the 'collega consulum' and was 'eisdem auspiciis creatus'. Election was of course by the 'comitia centuriata'. Practically, the praetor became the subordinate of the consuls when they were present, but he was capable of exercising all the functions of the consuls when necessary. The consuls ceased to be legal officers for the rest of the Republican age, with few unimportant exceptions. It appears that the patricians valued their control over the administration of the civil law more highly than the other functions which had belonged to the chief magistrates.

The first plebeian consul, 367.

331. At the same time was instituted a new magistracy, the curule aedileship, to which a peculiar rule applied. This magistracy was held by patricians and plebeians in alternate years. Election was by the 'comitia tributa'. A natural consequence was that the plebeian aediles, though they continued to be nominated by the purely plebeian assembly, the 'concilium plebis', lost their old close association with the tribunes of the plebs and were connected in their functions with the curule aediles. The removal of disabilities proceeded rapidly. We have no record of statutes sweeping away restrictions on the dictatorship, censorship and praetorship; but there was a plebeian dictator in 356; a censor in 351, and a praetor in 337.

The office of curule aedile instituted.

332. The conditions, however, of the consulship were not completely settled by the law which came into force in 367. Tradition holds that this law gave the plebeians a right to one of the two consulships. Perhaps the truth is that both places were opened to the two orders alike. At any rate some years

The plebeians and the consulship.

between 367 and 342 saw two patrician consuls. This was made impossible by the obscure military mutiny of 342, which led to the Third Secession. The plebeians remained eligible for both consulships, and were given by a new law an absolute right to one. A similar law was carried by Publilius Philo in 339 with regard to the censorship. Yet it was not till 172 that two plebeians held office as consuls together, and not till 131 that two plebeians carried out the census.

333. The first great priesthood for which the lower order became eligible was that of keepers of the Sibylline books; and this is natural, as these were concerned with foreign cults and, unlike the augurs and pontifices, had no close connexion with public affairs. Their title had been 'duouiri sacris faciundis'. By a Licinio-Sextian law they became 'decemviri', and half the places were reserved for plebeians. The lex Ogulnia of 300 raised the numbers of the augural college from 4 to 8 and that of the pontifices from 5 to 9; in the former body four of the places, and in the latter five, were reserved for the newcomers. After this the only offices restricted to patricians were minor sacred posts, those of the 'rex sacrorum', the flamens, the Salii and some others, with that of the interrex. It was a matter of custom, rather than of right, that the man who stood first on the roll of the Senate ('princeps senatus'), and was asked first for his opinion, was a patrician until the time of Sulla.

334. For the complete equalisation of the two orders, it was necessary to liberate the assemblies from patrician control. The evidence concerning the process by which this was achieved is so defective that no clear account of it can be given. Only a few main points can be regarded here. One of the laws passed by Publilius Philo in 339 directed that the sanction known as 'patrum auctoritas' should be given in advance to laws which were to come before the 'comitia centuriata'. Much controversy has arisen concerning the nature of this 'patrum auctoritas'. That it was not abolished, but remained as a form without force in later times, is in accordance with the Roman spirit; and its survival was partly due to a religious element which it contained. Two passages, one in Livy (vi 34) and one in Cicero (*De Dom.* 38), which no ingenuity has been able to explain away, prove that the 'patres', who exercised the 'auctoritas', even at the end of the Republic, were still patrician. The best of many theories is that they were the patrician section in the Senate. It is not surprising that little or nothing should be said in Roman literature about this ancient form. It had ceased to have interest excepting for the lawyer and the antiquary. When an interrex had to be appointed, a body called 'patres' made the nomination. They were probably the same body who gave the 'patrum auctoritas'.

335. So far as legislation was concerned, the 'comitia centuriata' was

The plebeians and the various priestly offices.

The gradual liberation of the assemblies from patrician control.

Lex Publilia on 'patrum auctoritas', 339.

completely freed by the *lex Publilia*. We have seen that Livy imagined the 'concilium plebis' to have been unshackled in 449, by a *lex Valeria Horatia* which provided that 'plebiscita' should bind the whole body politic. Yet in 339 *Publius Philo*, and in 287 *Hortensius*, passed statutes identical in substance with that of *Valerius* and *Horatius*. That resolutions of the 'concilium plebis' could be made binding before 287 is shown by indisputable examples. But the nature of the additional sanction required is uncertain. Whether the 'patrum auctoritas' was applicable to the 'concilium plebis' is very doubtful. The only sure statement that can be made is that all three assemblies, the 'centuriata', the 'tributa' and the 'concilium plebis', were on the same footing after the *lex Hortensia* of 287. To the resolutions of the first and second the name 'lex' is in its strictest sense applicable; while the decisions of the third are only entitled to be called 'plebiscita'. But after 287 every statute contained a clause 'siue haec lex est, siue plebiscitum', implying that the name had become a matter of indifference. It is probable that, even before 287, the idea that the tribune only summoned the plebeians to his assembly, had become a fiction. We hear nothing of the ejection of patricians from the 'concilium plebis'. They doubtless attended and voted without any notice being taken of their presence. The 'patrum auctoritas' had been required for elections as well as for laws. By a *lex Maenia*, of uncertain date, but probably connected with the legislation of *Hortensius*, elections were finally freed, in the same manner as laws.

The *lex Hortensia* of 287.

About the liberation of the 'comitia tributa' in matters of legislation we have absolutely no information. *Mommsen* supposed that the *lex Valeria Horatia* of 449 really gave full validity to the acts of this assembly, and that the term, in the original text, was 'populiscita', not 'plebiscita'. This is a very dubious speculation. Scholars still occasionally deny that any distinction ever existed between the 'concilium plebis' and the 'comitia tributa'. And indeed the evidence for the distinction is mostly indirect. But it is nevertheless strong. The whole evolution of popular institutions at Rome becomes much less intelligible if the separate existence of a purely plebeian assembly is denied.

The *lex Hortensia* marks the final triumph of democracy at Rome. It established, in theory, the unrestricted sovereignty of the popular assemblies. But, as we have seen, the practical working of the Roman institutions and the strong ascendancy of the 'mos maiorum' gave democracy at Rome a far different aspect than that which it wore in Greece. After the removal of plebeian disabilities, 'nobilitas' depended on the number and importance of the offices of State which members of a family had held. The difference between patrician and plebeian birth had little but social importance. A ring of governing families was formed, surrounded by barriers so strong that it was, so long as the Republic lasted, a herculean task for a newcomer (a 'nouus homo') to burst through them,

and climb to the highest offices. Thus, in practice, the government became once more oligarchical, however democratic its basis might be. The great organ of this oligarchy was of course the Senate. But the historians of Rome, both in ancient and in modern times, have often erred in representing the period that lies between the *lex Hortensia* and the advent of the Gracchi as one of unbroken Senatorial supremacy. We proceed to give a short survey of the constitutional history of this period.

336. In the year 241, the process of expanding the 'Romanus ager' by the creation of new local tribes, was brought to a conclusion. The tribes created after the foundation of the Republic had borne geographical titles, but in 241 the thirty-fifth was named 'tribus Quirina'. The designation seems to have been chosen as a sign that the ancient policy of expansion was definitely abandoned. This decision seems to have been due partly to a consciousness of the practical evils entailed by a wide dispersion of the burgess body and partly to a growing exclusiveness, which disliked the incorporation of non-burgesses with the community. On the whole, the Romans had hitherto been liberal in the extension of their franchise to conquered peoples. But it must not be supposed that at this time the Roman citizenship was ardently desired by the Latin and Italian cities. During the Hannibalic war a body of Praenestines declined the proffered gift, and some towns unwillingly received it even at the time of the Social War.

337. Probably about 241, certainly not later than 220, what is commonly known as 'the democratic reform of the comitia centuriata' was carried out. Existing information about this change is so obscure that scholars have framed a number of theories to explain it. Certain it is that, in some way, voting by centuries in the 'comitia centuriata' was combined with voting by tribes. The simplest scheme is still that of the sixteenth century scholar, Ottavio Pantagato. According to his explanation, each of the thirty-five tribes was divided into a senior and a junior portion, consisting respectively of the men above and below the age of 45 (or 46). In each half the men were classed by property, in the five Servian classes. Each of these class-sections was called a century. There would thus be 350 centuries, to which would have to be added the 18 centuries of 'equites'. The language used by Livy and some other ancient authorities in recording the proceedings of the 'comitia centuriata' is so loose that objections may easily be raised against the scheme of Pantagato, but it seems to be better founded than its rivals. The difficulties created for modern scholars by the imperfection of the records is strikingly illustrated by a solution which Mommsen put forward in his great work, the *Römische Staatsrecht*. It is so highly complicated and unpractical that it wears the appearance of a counsel of despair. Whether, in its actual working, this reform deserved to be called 'democratic' is open to doubt, but the question cannot be discussed here.

The close of  
the creation of  
new local  
tribes, 241.

'The demo-  
cratic reform  
of the comitia  
centuriata'.



338. About this time, a strong democratic party sprang up, with an able leader, Gaius Flaminius, to whom historians have usually done less than justice. His law of 232, dividing the 'ager Gallicus' among citizen settlers, is sometimes described as the only measure passed in the teeth of the Senate between 287 and 133. This is not strictly accurate. But Flaminius was in some respects the forerunner of the Gracchi, particularly in his policy of Romanising or Latinising territory won from other races. A study of the years during which the Hannibalic war raged on Italian soil, shows that while the war on the whole tended to strengthen the oligarchy, successful opposition was on several occasions offered to the Senate. It is seldom recognised that the great Scipio won his ascendancy by demagogic methods. Sallust's declaration (in *Hist.* i fragm. 11) that between the Second and Third Punic Wars the Roman Commonwealth was administered 'optumis moribus et maxuma concordia' is true on neither of its sides. Many facts attest the growing demoralisation of the governing circle. And a tremendous political struggle was ended by the downfall of the Scipios. The Republican constitution, devised at first for the administration of a small city with a petty territory in Italy, now had to be adapted to the government of a growing empire, with distant and alien populations. The strain upon the constitution, destined to be increased to the breaking point, was already severely felt before the advent of the Gracchi. The 'lex Aelia' and 'lex Fufia', always described by Cicero as main bulwarks of the constitution, because they justified the use of sacred principles to obstruct legislation, belonged to the generation which preceded Tiberius Gracchus. The extension of the empire and the wars accompanying it had led to new constitutional practices. The 'pro-magistracy', whereby a consul, praetor or quaestor might be continued in office, solely for service outside the city, was created under the pressure of war and of empire, in the course of the third century B.C. For this purpose there was 'prorogatio imperii', prolongation of command, by the assembly. The dictatorship died with the Hannibalic war. And the great wars of conquest led to the frequent suspension of a main safeguard against the supremacy of individuals, viz. a statute of 342, which forbade the same magistracy to be held by the same person twice within ten years. The difficulty of controlling magistrates who served in distant lands, and of protecting subject peoples from oppression, led to the passing in 149 of the famous 'lex Calpurnia repetundarum', which established the first permanent court or 'quaestio'. At first the procedure was not strictly criminal, as the guilty magistrate was merely condemned to restore his ill-gotten gains. But succeeding enactments soon gave the court a really criminal character.

Constitutional measures prior to the age of the Gracchi.

The 'lex Flaminiæ' of 232.

The 'lex Aelia' and 'lex Fufia' of 156.

The 'lex Calpurnia repetundarum', 149.

339. It is often supposed that when Tiberius Gracchus asserted the ascendancy of the comitia over the Senate, he was furbishing up a rusty

weapon from the constitutional armoury. This view will not survive a reading of the famous sketch of the Roman constitution which Polybius wrote in his Sixth Book, only a few years before the great tribune began his political career. The full sovereignty of the Roman assemblies is there asserted as a living reality, not as an obsolete theory. And clearly a considerable party in the Senate was discontented with the existing state of affairs and vaguely desired reform, though most of its members fell away when a practical reformer appeared on the scene. The control of the 'ager publicus' had never been abandoned by the State, but it had been laxly carried out by the consuls and censors whose duty it was to enforce it. The vital part of the agrarian scheme of Tiberius Gracchus consisted of the standing commission ('tresuiri agris dandis assignandis'), by which security was taken that the enactment should not become a dead letter. The great significance of the movement of Tiberius is that it opens a period of constitutional unsettlement, in which the democratic party strains to the utmost the theory of the absolute authority of the comitia, while the Senate asserts rights which rest neither on law nor on custom. The question often raised, whether Tiberius acted constitutionally when he induced the comitia to deprive the opposing tribune Octavius of his office, has but little practical importance. In not a few cases, the comitia deprived officers of their imperium, without the legality of the action being questioned. The sovereignty of the assemblies was carried to a 'reductio ad absurdum' when an autocracy was based on a *lex Valeria* by Sulla; and every subsequent infringement of liberty pleaded a similar justification. But in the comitia, at least after the Social War, nothing like a free and untrammelled vote existed. The very substance of that which called itself law was brute force.

340. The new era ushered in by Tiberius Gracchus soon showed its characteristics. For the first time in Roman history, blood was freely shed in a party conflict, and the aristocrats who spilt it acted without any kind of public sanction. Also the Senate, without authority from the comitia, issued a commission for punishing the adherents of Gracchus. But democracy did not perish with its leader. The Senate was not strong enough to reverse his great agrarian policy. The power to adjudicate on disputed questions concerning the 'publicus ager', which had been granted to the agrarian commission by Tiberius, was taken away and given back to the consuls in 129. The commission had done the main part of its work, but existed till 118. A statute in 111 ended the agrarian movement initiated by the elder Gracchus.

341. Meanwhile the career of his younger brother Gaius had altered the face of the political world. Even before his advent, the relation between the Roman government and the Italian allies had led to strife. For the first time, in 125, a consul (Fulvius) had brought forward a bill for enfranchising allies.

Tiberius  
Gracchus, 133.

Characteristics  
of the new era.

Gaius  
Gracchus,  
123, 122.

Thenceforward the mass of the unenfranchised Italians and Latins were supporters of the democratic party. The tragic revolt of Fregellae (125) ensued on the failure of the bill. In his second tribunate Gaius Gracchus revived and extended the proposal of Fulvius. Saturninus, again without success, headed the agitation. In 95 B.C. the great 'alien act' was passed,—the *lex Licinia Mucia*, which heralded the Social War. Then a final effort was made in vain by Liuius Drusus in 91, to bring the allies within the constitutional pale. The barriers had to be forced by war. First the *lex Iulia* of 90 enfranchised all communities which had kept peace or chose to lay down arms. Then the *lex Plautia Papiria* of 89 allowed individuals to obtain the Roman citizenship even if their cities did not take common action. And the *lex Pompeia* of the same year gave the 'Latinitas', or the privileges which Latin towns had enjoyed, to the inhabitants of Gallia Cisalpina, in so far as they had not obtained the full 'ciuitas'. This use of the 'Latinitas', whereby cities not Latin by origin were equated with the Latin towns, is first recorded in 172, when Carteia in Spain, a town inhabited by Roman soldiers and their children by Spanish wives, received this status, which was often used in later times as a convenient stage on the road to the full Roman franchise.

His legislation  
on the allies.

342. The reconstitution of the 'equites' by Gaius Gracchus was his greatest political achievement. The influence which he gave to the 'equites' was indirect rather than direct, and was exercised chiefly through the court which tried provincial governors, the 'quaestio repetundarum'. The juries in this court were now comprised of 'equites' solely, instead of senators as before. The great companies of publicani who farmed the taxes were guided by members of the equestrian body, and it may be said, with rough truth, that the new organisation was one of the capitalist class, whose interests conflicted with those of the senators at many points. How Gracchus defined an 'eques' in his law, is a difficult matter to make out. The *lex Acilia repetundarum* of 122 has been preserved for us on a bronze tablet, but it has *lacunae*, and unfortunately one occupies the space in which the qualification of the 'eques' was given. The probability is that Gracchus first laid down that an 'eques' must possess property to the value of 400,000 sesterces. But this is nowhere recorded, and in literature that qualification is first mentioned by Horace (*Ep.* i 1, 58). The silence of Cicero can hardly be understood if, as Mommsen supposes, only the 1800 equites who had the 'equus publicus' were authorised by Gracchus to sit on criminal juries.

His reconsti-  
tution of the  
'equites'.

343. No other measures of Gaius Gracchus have the same constitutional importance as those relating to the allies and to the equites. But his reaffirmation of the clause in the XII Tables giving the 'comitia centuriata' alone the right to authorise the trial of citizens for criminal offences, deserves mention; also his

His other  
measures.

measure to secure fair trial ('ne quis iudicio circumueniretur'); and his law requiring the Senate to name the provinces which consuls would govern before the consuls were elected. Other measures, such as the sale of corn to citizens at about half the market rate, and the rearrangement of the taxation of the new province of Asia (for which Gracchus has been unjustly blamed), only affected the constitution indirectly.

344. It remains to speak of one scheme of Gaius which was of far-reaching importance: his colonial scheme. The Romanisation and Latinisation of Italy had been promoted in early days largely by the planting of Roman and Latin colonies in conquered districts. These 'coloniae' were, in actual fact, fortresses intended to secure the newly-won land. The planting of these fortresses prepared the way for that expansion of the 'Romanus ager' by the extension of the system of local tribes, which has been explained above (§ 336). As we have seen, a limit was set to that expansion in 241 B.C. Within the boundaries of this tribe system, towns still remained which were unenfranchised, and beyond those boundaries, only the Roman element in the citizen-colonies (nearly all on the sea-coast), and scattered individuals not attached to these colonies, were fully privileged. Emigration, in the modern sense, had not been greatly practised by the Romans. The normal number of citizens drafted into a colony was 300; of Latins often some thousands. Conquered territory in Italy was, as a rule, not exploited by the conquerors for their own benefit, and the burden of holding down the conquered peoples was thrown mainly on the Latins. This old system of colonisation did not long survive the Hannibalic war. Aquileia, founded in 181, was the latest Latin foundation of the old series. Only about ten Roman colonies were founded before 245. The next group was created between 191 and 157, and comprised seventeen communities. That the establishment of Roman colonies was again being mooted when Gaius Gracchus came to the front is shown by the settlement of Fabrateria, in the territory of Fregellae, in 124.

Gracchus was the first, so far as we know, to conceive the idea of planting Romans outside Italy, and also of using colonial foundations inside and outside Italy, in relief of poverty among citizens. His scheme was in reality a grand extension of the policy of his brother's agrarian law. Although the Senatorial party thwarted the project, and allowed the creation of only two of the Gracchan colonies in Italy, while the colonists settled at Carthage were granted no communal organisation, yet this measure of Gracchus forms a landmark in the development of the Roman power. He began the great development by which the name and status of 'Roman' was spread over the empire. The process ended with the famous decree of Caracalla in 212. But the only extra-Italian colonies established before Caesar's time were Narbo Martius in 118 (whence the oldest Roman province in Gaul was called 'Narbonensis') and Eporedia (*Ivrea*) in 100, situated in 'Gallia Transpadana'.

His scheme for  
the colonies.



345. A new constitutional departure is marked by the first example of the 'senatus consultum ultimum', by which the Senate, apart from the comitia, authorised the consuls to use force against Gaius Gracchus and his party. A Senatorial criminal commission followed. The constitutionality of the 'senatus consultum ultimum' was hotly disputed by the democrats so long as the Republic lasted. The attempt to punish by prosecution the consul Opimius for acting on the decree failed. The most famous occasions on which the decree was passed later were in 100, when Saturninus was suppressed, in 63, when Cicero was authorised to execute Catiline's associates, and in 49, when the Senate proclaimed war against Caesar. Cicero suffered for his action, not by prosecution before a court, but by a resolution of the 'comitia centuriata', practically an 'act of attainder'.

The 'senatus  
consultum  
ultimum'.

346. The period between the death of Gaius Gracchus and the outbreak of the Social War is not marked by many events, other than those already mentioned, which have any important bearing on the constitution. By the 'lex Seruilia iudiciaria' of 107 an endeavour was made to oust the equites from the criminal juries. This law probably did not pass; if passed, it was almost immediately repealed. The 'rogatio Mamilia' of 111 established a temporary 'quaestio' to try officers who had corruptly favoured Jugurtha. The struggle of Saturninus (103—100) to reopen the agrarian question, the Italian question, and others, was frustrated by the treachery of his ally, Marius. His laws, excepting one which redefined treason, and substituted the title 'maiestas' for the old 'perduellio', and perhaps established a special treason-court, were annulled. It should be noticed that the Senate took upon itself to declare these laws of Saturninus to be invalid; and dealt similarly with laws passed by a tribune Titius of the succeeding year. This was, so far as is known, a novel usurpation.

Further legis-  
lation prior to  
the Social  
War.

347. The process by which the Latins and Italians were finally enrolled as citizens cannot be easily discerned, amid the obscurity of the historical sources. Appian states that new tribe-districts were created, but it is not probable that the number of the tribes ever exceeded 35. According to Velleius Paterculus (ii 20) the new citizens were restricted to 8 out of the 35. The information given by Appian and Velleius may relate to temporary measures, or may be otherwise imperfect. That some restrictions existed at first is shown by the measure of Sulpicius Rufus, the brilliant tribune of 88, who proposed to distribute the Latins and Italians throughout the tribal organisation. This seems to have been accomplished by Cinna, whose enactment was not disturbed by Sulla. But possibly the final settlement was only effected by the censors of the year 70.

The process of  
conferring the  
citizenship on  
the Latins and  
Italians, 90—  
70.

348. That Sulla carried some laws, when he suppressed Sulpicius Rufus in 88, is certain, but we cannot distinguish them in our authorities from enactments passed after his return from

Sulla.

Asia. His measures of 88 were annulled as soon as his back was turned. The anarchy which existed between 87 and 81 when Sulla re-entered Rome, need not be described here. His rule was pure autocracy, authorised nominally by law, and resting mainly on terrorism. The Senate obtained a supreme control over legislation. The veto of the tribunes on the resolutions of the Senate and comitia was removed. The importance of the tribunate was enormously depressed by preventing all who had held the office from pursuing a political career. These restrictions on democracy gradually disappeared and were finally removed during the consulship of Pompey and Crassus in 70. But in other directions Sulla made a deep and lasting impression upon Roman institutions.

349. He carried to its completion the process begun in 149 by the lex Calpurnia, and established permanent criminal courts ('quaestiones') eight or nine in number, for the trial of all offences, and each of these courts was governed by a great fundamental law. That the old cumbrous procedure of trial by the comitia was not formally abolished, is shown by a threat which Cicero hurled at Verres, and by the prosecution of Rabirius for 'perduellio' in 63. Sulla placed the Senators once more on the juries, but in 70, by the lex Aurelia, juries were drawn in equal numbers from Senators, equites, and tribuni aerarii (see § 312). Sulla's scheme for the administration of the government by the magistrates was carefully thought out. It assumed that the consuls and the eight praetors would pass their year of office in the city. At the end of the year there would be ten pro-magistrates ready to take command in the ten provinces. An increase in the number of quaestors from 8 to 20 provided amply for the subordinate duties of government in Italy and abroad.

350. But the large addition to the body of quaestors had another purpose. The quaestorship now carried with it a right to a seat in the Senate, and the annual elections to this office would suffice automatically to keep the membership of the Senate near the number aimed at, six hundred in all. This was the last stage of a long evolution, whereby the Senate became a collection of men who had been magistrates. It is difficult to determine the times when the different steps were taken by which this goal was reached. In theory, the censors and before them the consuls were originally not bound by any law in their selection of senators ('lectio senatus'). But custom, the powerful 'mos maiorum', would from the first prescribe to them in a large and growing number of cases the proper men to appoint. It is highly probable that the first plebeian to enter the Senate was the first plebeian who held the consular tribunate (§ 327). The periodical revision of the list by censors may not have been older than the censorship of Appius Claudius (312). A lex Quinia, probably of about this time, required the censors, in filling up vacancies, to select 'the best men from every rank' ('ex omni ordine optimum quem-

quaestiones  
perpetuae.

Administra-  
tion by  
magistrates.

Increase in  
the number  
of quaestors.

The Senate.

que'). Doubtless this law strengthened the claims of ex-magistrates, without giving them any absolute right. Before the Hannibalic war the privilege had been definitely accorded to all officers down to the curule aediles. In the Gracchan age it was extended to the plebeian aediles. Near the same time, probably, was passed the 'plebiscitum Atinium', which conferred the right on the tribunes. The measures of Sulla rendered the old 'lectio senatus' by censors unnecessary for maintaining the numbers of the Senators at the proper level. But it is a mistake to assert, as is often done, that Sulla abolished the censorship. He only provided otherwise for some of the duties of the office, and, apart from the 'lectio senatus', the changes he made were probably not intended to be permanent. At all events the office took a fresh start in 70 without any new enactment, so far as is known, though it retained only an irregular and precarious existence after that.

351. The period between the full restoration of the old Republican constitution in 70 and its destruction by Caesar, is one of lawlessness, in which the Republic subsisted in form, though 70—50 B.C. its principles were shattered, and politics meant in the main a struggle for ascendancy by the use of brute force. Three men, Pompey, Caesar and Crassus, were able in 60 to make themselves practically 'tyranni' (as Cicero called them) without any formal authorisation. Only a few of the most prominent features of this era of confusion need here be sketched. The extraordinary powers conferred on Pompeius in 67 by the lex Gabinia, which armed him against the pirates, and by the lex Manilia, which commissioned him to attack Mithridates, were rightly regarded by Cato as destructive of the Republic. A large part of the resources of the Empire in men, money and ships, was placed at the disposal of one man. His imperium was made equal to that of other governors of provinces within the region of his operations. For this exceptional power there was a precedent, on a small scale, in the case of M. Antonius, who in 102 received a special commission to suppress piracy. When Pompeius returned to Italy in 61, it was generally expected that a repetition of the 'dictatorship' of Sulla would ensue. But, when the army was dismissed, its leader was powerless. Facing a hostile Senate he was driven to his compact with Caesar and Crassus. Caesar, as consul, gave him in 59 what he wanted, namely, the confirmation by the comitia of his 'acta',—the extensive series of arrangements made with princes, peoples and towns in the East,—and lands for his veterans, which were secured by Caesar's 'lex agraria'. This divided the 'Campanus ager' and the 'ager Stellatis' which the Gracchi, Saturninus, Titius, and others who had raised the agrarian question, had left untouched. Cicero in 63 as consul had frustrated the most gigantic agrarian measure ever proposed, that of Rullus.

352. The command given to Caesar for five years in Gaul was another great departure from Republican custom. And the remission by a legislative act of a portion of the payment which the 59—57 B.C.

'publicani' had undertaken to make for the right of collecting taxes in Asia, was a serious invasion of one of the most cherished privileges of the Senate, its control of finance. It is no wonder that the aristocrats desired to annul the whole legislation of 59, carried by violence and in defiance of the religious restraints on legislation. It was necessary for the 'tyranni' to remove Cicero and Cato. Clodius, by enactment, exiled Cicero for his obedience to the 'senatus consultum ultimum' against the Catilinarians. Cato saved himself by accepting a disgraceful commission abroad. When Cicero was restored in 57 (by legislation), he had learned his lesson.

353. Clodius and other tribunes year after year carried outrageous laws in packed assemblies. The streets over and over again ran 55-52 B.C. with blood and elections were so delayed that 'interregna' ensued. The conference of Luca (56) led to an extension of Caesar's exceptional command in Gaul for five years, and similar powers were given to Crassus in Syria and to Pompeius in the provinces of Spain. The year 52 saw the amazing anomaly of Pompeius as sole consul for some months, in consequence of the killing of Clodius by Milo. Drastic legislation for the suppression of disorder ensued. Pompeius did not proceed to Spain, though nominally its governor. He was now in the extraordinary position of being at one and the same time consul and proconsul. And he passed a law giving him his Spanish governorship for a second period of five years, although by another enactment he had ordered that consuls and praetors should not be eligible for provincial commands till five years had elapsed from the end of their year of office.

The Republic was practically at an end. Cicero was not wrong in saying that both leaders, Caesar and Pompey, aimed at a despotism. Fate decided that the despotism should array itself to some extent in democratic trappings. The signal for battle was given by the appearance in Caesar's camp of two tribunes who had championed his cause, and had fled from violence.

1 Jan.  
49 B.C.

To complete a general view of the Roman Republican institutions, it is now necessary to fill in some details. First, some general principles affecting the system of the magistracies must be stated.

354. The success of the Republican polity depended first on the powers of the separate magistrates and their relations to each other, secondly on the general supervision of the Senate. The system of veto, by which a magistrate of equal authority with another, or of superior authority, could bar the other's action, with the tribunes in the ascendant over all, and the Senate, theoretically, in subordination to the magistrates, seems at first sight as impossible a form of government as ever appeared in history. And it would have been utterly unworkable, but for the unparalleled reverence which the Romans entertained for established custom. Every office and every institution became encrusted with precedents, which limited its

Principles  
affecting  
magistracies.



theoretical power. The rights of interference with each other which the magistrates possessed rarely needed to be exercised before the age of revolution; and the officers of State submitted with little resistance to the general control of the Senate. The Tribunate itself was, in the main, an instrument of aristocratic government, and was often invoked to coerce recalcitrant officials. Livy makes a speaker, as early as 294 B.C., describe the tribunes as 'the chattels of the nobles' ('*mancipia nobilium*', x 37, 11). The great distinction of the Gracchi is that they breached the barriers of the '*mos maiorum*', and thereby revealed the certain doom of the outworn Republic. The Gracchan revolution was in essence a severance between the Senate and the nominally sovereign people, whose assemblies were so constituted that they were easily driven hither and thither by fraud and force, to which recourse was had by all factions in the community.

355. A few words must be said of the general powers and conditions attached to the magistracies, and some of the leading peculiarities of each office must be mentioned. Every magistrate had '*potestas*', but only four, the dictator, consul, praetor, magister equitum, possessed '*imperium*'. The latter belonged, in fact, to any officer who was capable of commanding an army. As regards *imperium*, it was profoundly affected by the existence of the '*pomoerium*', a consecrated line running round the city. This marked the separation between the '*imperium domi*', subject to many limitations, and the '*imperium militiae*', in theory at first unlimited, but restrained later by certain checks. With the *imperium* was closely bound up the right to a triumph, under conditions which varied from time to time. As the triumph was a military function, the unrestricted *imperium* was conferred for the day of the triumph, within the *pomoerium*. In the case of the pro-magistrate, whose *imperium* was given him solely for service outside, a special act of the assembly was needed to continue his authority for the day. As the magister equitum never held an independent command, he never enjoyed a triumph.

356. Many official acts were attended by the observance of auspices of different kinds, and the privileges of the magistrates in making inquiry of the gods were regulated by elaborate rules. Any neglect of duty in this respect invalidated the action which followed, such as a law voted by the assembly, or an election, which then laboured under a fault ('*vitium*'). In respect of sacred matters, the tribunes were in a peculiar position, which bore traces of the early denial of religious capacity to the plebs. A tribune was not authorised to ask about the will of heaven before proposing a law or holding an election ('*auspiciū impetratium*'). But, if heaven declared its will unsolicited ('*auspiciū oblatium*'), custom required even the irreligious officer to obey, and in that case '*vitium*' might ensue. The enforcement of these '*vitia*', and the perversion thereby of religion for political ends, existed

*potestas and  
imperium.*

*The obser-  
vance of  
auspices.*

long before the time of the Gracchi, but is especially characteristic of the declining Republic. About the end of the sixth century of Rome two laws, the *lex Aelia*, and the *lex Fufia*, regulated the right of the magistrates to announce unfavourable omens by the process known as '*obnuntiatio*', or '*seruare de caelo*'. Cicero repeatedly expresses the belief, common to the optimates, that these statutes were great safeguards against revolutionary legislation.

357. All magistrates (and the '*pontifex maximus*') had the right of issuing commands to the citizens within limits which were drawn partly by custom, partly by law. If the commands were disobeyed, compulsion ('*coercitio*') came into play. But it was strongly restrained by the right of appeal ('*prouocatio*'), which every citizen possessed. Against non-citizens authority was almost unlimited. For citizens there existed by law a '*maxima multa*', or fine of 3020 asses, against which no appeal was permitted. To make certain that the offender would suffer, the magistrate might impound property ('*pignora capere*') and even destroy it ('*caedere pignora*'). Every magistrate had the right to acquaint the citizens with matters belonging to his office. This he did either by proclamation ('*edictum*') or by making an announcement in a '*contio*'. To a large extent, the edicts of the magistrates obtained the force of law, even without the sanction of the assemblies. This was especially the case with the edicts of the '*praetor urbanus*', issued annually, which grew into a great code of civil law. The last issue by the praetor Saluius Iulianus in 131 A.D. gave this code its final form. There was a similar aedilician edict, affecting market-law and police. The legislative power of the emperors was to a large extent a continuation of this Republican '*ius edicendi*'.

The rules with regard to the summoning of the people to vote were rigid. We have seen that only officers invested with *imperium* could preside at legislative or electoral assemblies of the whole Roman people. Only the '*ius agendi cum plebe*', not '*cum populo*', belonged to the Tribunes (§ 335). When a tribune prosecuted an offender before the '*comitia centuriata*', a praetor called together the assembly for him. On the relation of the magistrates to the Senate see §§ 310, 374.

358. The principle of '*collegiality*' in office made it necessary to prevent collisions. In some instances magistrates of equal authority were assigned definite and separate spheres ('*prouinciae*'). This was the case with the quaestors, excepting the two '*quaestores aerarii*'. The praetors also had separate functions and, eventually, the aediles. Where two colleagues were face to face with the same duty, they might in some cases agree to carry it out in common; or, if this were out of the question, one of them might be selected, by consent ('*comparatio*') or by casting of lots ('*sortitio*'). In some instances the duty might be exercised by the two officers in turn. For example, when two consuls were equally in command of an army, the

Magisterial  
edicts.

Distribution  
of magis-  
terial duties.

actual direction of operations might alternate between them day by day or month by month. The lot determined the assignment of provincial governorships, between consuls, and again between praetors; also the parcelling out of duties among quaestors and praetors.

359. The magistrates were distinguished in the eyes of the people by the external insignia of office. The 'sella curulis' (literally 'chariot-seat') belonged to those who were possessed of imperium, with the addition of the censors and curule aediles.

Insignia of office.

The tribunes sat on low benches ('subsellia'), so too, probably, the plebeian aediles, while the quaestors had a seat peculiar to themselves. The 'fasces', bundles of rods, were marks of the imperium. Where 'prouocatio' did not hold, each 'fascis' had in it an axe, as a sign that the officer had originally held unrestricted power over the lives of the citizens, whom he might flog and then behead. Each 'fascis' was carried by a lictor. A dictator had 24 lictors, a consul 12, a praetor in the city 2, outside the city 6. The 'toga praetexta', a purple-bordered garment, was worn in the city by those officers who had a right to the 'sella curulis', and by some priests. In the capital a purple robe was only worn on the day of triumph; in the field purple was the colour of the general's uniform, or 'paludamentum'. As the emperor was sole commander of the army, this purple robe became distinctive of him.

360. The accession to office was determined by certain rules. Full citizenship was in all cases of course a requisite. And a character which bore the stain of 'infamia' was a disqualification for every public function. This was sometimes due to occupations deemed disgraceful in themselves (such as that of gladiator or actor or 'praeco'), sometimes to the effect of judicial proceedings. Even the honest wage-earner was disqualified, though tradition loved to tell of dictators and generals like Fabricius and Curius Dentatus, who were poor farmers, working with their own hands.

Qualifications for office.

Custom tended at an early date to fix the normal age for office, the order in which offices should be held and the intervals of time between them, and practice was finally crystallised into law by the lex Villia Annalis of 180, which may have embodied some earlier enactments. But the details of this law, and of earlier custom, are hard to make out. Polybius tells us that in his time ten years' military service (which began at 17) was necessary before the first political office could be filled. The lowest age for holding the quaestorship would thus be the twenty-eighth year. The quaestorship, curule aedileship, praetorship and consulship had to be taken in this order. The plebeian offices do not seem to have been affected by the law. A clear interval of two years (biennium) was bound to elapse between the tenure of two offices. This provision was necessary for enforcing the responsibility of magistrates, since it was a rule rarely infringed that no magistrate was prosecuted for malpractice until he was out of office. This

cursus honorum.

fact was emphasised by the use in political trials of the word 'priuatus' as the equivalent of 'reus'. It is impossible to make out with precision what was the earliest age for holding the consulship; but it seems certain that it was later than would be determined by allowing merely the 'bien nium' as interval between successive magistracies. It was somewhere about the 40th year, before Sulla; and somewhere about the 43rd, after Sulla had raised the age for the quaestorship to the completed 30th year. As the number of praetorships was greater than the number of aedileships, many men passed straight from the quaestorship to the praetorship, but were not permitted thereby to reach the higher magistracy earlier.

**361.** The tenure of two magistracies together was forbidden by a statute of 342. Whether plebeian magistracies were affected by this law or not, practice included them in the prohibition. An exceptional charge, such as a seat on the agrarian commission of Ti. Gracchus, could always be undertaken along with other functions. The magistracy and the pro-magistracy were never combined till 52, when Pompey was consul and at the same time governor of the Spanish provinces as pro-consul. When a legislator created a new office he and his kinsfolk were disqualified for it by a *lex Licinia* and a *lex Aebutia* of uncertain date. The prohibition was disregarded by Ti. Gracchus when he created his land-commission, and by some others. Perhaps a dispensation<sup>1</sup> was obtained from the comitia. Another enactment of 342 forbade two tenures of the same office within a space of ten years. The rule was often infringed in times of stress, as during the Hannibalic war, and under the threat of invasion by the Cimbri and Teutoni. Caesar took credit to himself for not having tried to obtain a second consulship in contravention of the law. Other conditions, as those of age, were relaxed in case of emergency, at first by resolution of the comitia, later by the Senate. There is no example of a second tenure of the censorship.

**362.** The consul's chief business in the city was to conduct the affairs of the Senate. The administration of the civil law was withdrawn from him in 367 (§ 330), and he only managed a few legal affairs of a non-contentious nature. His connexion with criminal prosecutions was slight, excepting when extraordinary commissions were issued by the Senate (§§ 340, 345). In cases of 'perduellio', he nominated the prosecutors, the 'duouiri perduellionis' (§ 311). Public order in Italy and the protection of national property, sacred or secular, were especially committed to his care. When censors were not in existence, many matters which came under their cognisance fell into his hands. Legislation was often carried through by him, but in the later Republican age it fell more and more into the hands of the tribunes. The nomination of a dictator was his privilege and it took place with solemn religious

Tenure of  
office.

Duties of the  
Consul.

<sup>1</sup> 'solutio legibus'.



observance. He was the chief representative of the community in sacred affairs and the usual commander in war.

363. The praetor was capable of undertaking every department of business which ordinarily belonged to the consul, in case of need. The chief praetor ('praetor urbanus') was the supreme civil judge, and he was not merely an administrator of the law, but a lawgiver (§ 357). His administration will be described in the section on Roman Law. About 242 a second praetor came into existence, the so-called 'praetor peregrinus', who was said at first 'ius inter peregrinos dicere', and later 'ius inter ciues et peregrinos dicere'. The 'iurisdictio' of these officers could only be exercised within the city. Sometimes these two departments were placed in the hands of one praetor. When Sulla completed the system of criminal courts ('quaestiones') and increased the number of praetors to eight, six were normally presidents of these courts, and as such were designated 'quaesitores'. One of the functions of the praetor urbanus was to arrange the lists of those liable to serve on the juries. He had the superintendence of the 'ludi Apollinares' (established in 212). The praetors and ex-praetors were, along with the consuls and ex-consuls, the regular governors of provinces.

364. The censor was the chief registrar and the leading financial officer of the community. He had a discretion which was practically unlimited, and irresponsible. The registers which recorded the property, and the status of citizens, as members of the tribes, the centuries, the equestrian body, and the Senate, were kept by him. He could alter the status of a citizen for moral reasons in several ways, by placing him among the 'aerarii', by removing him from one of the 'tribus rusticae' to one of the less honoured 'tribus urbanae', or by denying him a seat in the Senate. This decision was taken sometimes after a sort of trial. The charge, if proved, was often recorded as a 'nota censoria', or stigma affixed to the man's name by the censors. In the exercise of this duty the censor was absolutely uncontrolled, excepting by the veto of his colleague, until Clodius in 58 took away this power by a law. The reasons given for inflicting the degradation were sometimes whimsical. Cato punished a man for having kissed his wife in presence of their daughter. But the verdict of one set of censors might be, often was, reversed by their successors.

As officers of finance, the censors exercised great power. They sold to the companies of 'publicani' the right to collect the revenues, and to enjoy the use of national resources, and they entered into contracts for public works, for the repair of old buildings and the construction of new. These contracts were denoted by a curious name, 'ultra tributa', which is probably not connected with 'tributum', the property tax, as has been often supposed, but indicates that these contracts were not assigned ('tributa') as an inevitable duty, but beyond necessity ('ultra'). The censors were absolutely bound to provide for the collecting of revenue; they were not

absolutely bound to spend any of it in public works. The financial duty of a censor was summed up in the phrase 'uectigalia summis, ultro tributa infimis pretiis locare'. The discretion of the censors in all matters of taxation was extraordinarily unfettered. Thus Cato taxed at thirty times the ordinary rate property which he chose to regard as a proof of luxury. All contracts made by the censors ran for five years. The vindication of the national property against encroachment belonged to the censors while in office; at other times to the consuls.

The last duty of the censor before the expiry of his 18 months' tenure of office (§ 328) was 'condere lustrum', to carry out the great religious ceremony of national purification. Hence 'lustrum', which literally means 'a washing clean', came to be applied to the five years' interval between two sets of censors. The office grew steadily in dignity, and came to be regarded as the climax of a public career, so that it was usually taken after the consulship. But this was never made necessary by law. In official catalogues of the magistracies a trace is preserved of the lesser importance of this office in its early days. It is placed after the offices to which imperium belongs. The censor, it may be noted, derived none of his authority from the 'lex curiata de imperio'. In his case, after his election, a 'lex centuriata' was passed which gave him authority to act. As to the position of the censorship in its later days, see § 350.

365. The original aediles were assistants of the tribunes and sacrosanct like them. After 367 the plebeian aediles became, like the

Aediles.

curule, magistrates of the whole community (§ 331), and practically subordinate to the consuls. They had much to do with prosecutions, mainly or almost entirely for non-political offences, such as breaches of the laws concerning interest, those against raising the price of corn, and the sumptuary laws, also cases of public violence, trespasses on state property, and even sexual immorality. Their power of controlling the public markets was extensive, and gave them a certain jurisdiction (§ 357). It was their duty to avert the fear of famine in the city. The maintenance and purification of the city streets also fell to some extent upon the aediles, though the censors were also concerned. The same applies to the care of the aqueducts. Many matters of police came within their purview. The 'cura ludorum' was also chiefly a burden upon the aediles. Some of the 'ludi' were undertaken by the curule aediles, some by the plebeian, but Augustus transferred this whole duty to the praetors. The treasury supplied a subvention; yet, especially during the Republican period, immense sums were added by the magistrates themselves. Men who had passed the aedileship were in some cases presidents of the quaestiones ('quaesitores'), in default of praetors being available.

366. The early history of the quaestors is obscure. They became assistants of the consuls, particularly in the control of the 'aerarium'.

Quaestors.

As laws and 'senatus consulta' and innumerable other state documents were stored there, they were keepers of the archives.

The number of quaestors rose in 421 to four, in 267 (or 241) to eight, and in Sulla's time to twenty. Two ('quaestores urbani') continued to be attached to the aerarium. When a consul conducted a campaign, he had on his staff a quaestor, who attended to all financial matters connected with the army, and in particular to the sale of booty for the benefit of the treasury. The four new quaestors appointed in the third century B.C. were named 'quaestores classici'. That their original connexion was with the fleet is clear, but it was soon broken. To these quaestors were allotted separate spheres of action ('prouvinciae'). The most important was the 'quaestor Ostiensis', who, besides other duties, watched the importation of corn. In the late Republic one quaestor had a 'prouvincia aquaria', and looked after aqueducts, a duty shared with censors and aediles. The quaestors and pro-quaestors played a large part in the administration of the provinces. Their duties were primarily financial, but abroad other functions were frequently assigned to them. The connexion between the quaestor or pro-quaestor and the consul or pro-consul or pro-praetor under whom he served was so close as to be compared with the relation of son to father. Where this relation had subsisted, any public action of the lower officer against his former superior was condemned by public opinion.

367. The importance of the Tribune in the Republican scheme has been explained in outline above (§§ 322, 354), but some further particulars must here be given. The tribunician veto was Tribunes. of course more potent than any other, and it extended over a wide area; but it is a mistake to suppose it unlimited. In some directions it was barred by statute or custom. A tribune, for example, might, and often did, forbid the assembling of the electoral comitia for the *ordinary* magistrates (not for the *plebeian* magistrates) but he could not annul any election. So far as is known, no treaty of peace proposed to the assembly was ever vetoed. The use of the veto against the 'lex curiata de imperio', and also against the sentence of a criminal court, seems not to have been theoretically illegal, but it is not heard of till the era of confusion which heralded the fall of the Republic. A law of C. Gracchus forbade a tribune to intervene against the annual resolution of the Senate by which provinces were selected for the consuls. The 'intercessio', like other tribunicial privileges, was severely restricted by Sulla (§ 348). No attempt can be made to enumerate the multifarious cases in which the tribunes practised this legalised obstruction. The commonest uses of the 'intercessio' concerned 'decreta' of all sorts issued by magistrates, laws proposed to the comitia, and decrees of the Senate. The power of annulling general orders affecting citizens sprang from the 'auxilium' bestowed on the tribunes at the outset, which enabled them to protect individuals against the consequences of disobedience to magistrates. To announce, with regard to a general order, that all recalcitrants will be shielded against punishment, is in fact to render it inoperative. Where the action of a magistrate affected an

individual, the tribune only intervened on an appeal ('*appellatio*'): this was the case with the every-day interference with '*decreta*' belonging to civil law procedure. In such cases the tribunes often acted together and examined into the alleged grievance, and in fact constituted a high court of appeal. Although an act cancelled by one tribune could not be reinstated by another, tribunes could nevertheless hold harmless a man who disobeyed their colleagues. Thus, when one tribune, in 214, tried to prosecute two censors, the other nine took them under their protection.

The tribunes became the chief prosecutors in cases of high crimes and misdemeanours, particularly when committed by men who had held high office. As the Republic drew to its end, these prosecutions were more and more of a purely partisan character. The houses of the tribunes were required to be open day and night to suppliants for relief and they were forbidden to leave the city for more than a few hours. But, now and then, they were entrusted with commissions outside, as when they were sent, with other officers, to bring back the elder Scipio to meet charges preferred against him in 204. When an *interregnum* existed, the tribunes acquired increased importance, as they replaced the consuls in the conduct of the business of the Senate. The influence of the tribunes in the ordinary working of the constitution was recognised by the mention of them along with the consuls, praetors and Senate in official documents issued to foreign powers and received from them.

The power of the tribunate depended mainly on its character as '*sacrosancta potestas*'. The slightest opposition offered to the tribunes might be treated as an outrage deserving instant and extreme punishment, however highly placed the offender might be. Thus, a tribune of 130 B.C., who had been ejected from the Senate by the censor, Q. Metellus Macedonicus, actually attempted to hurl the latter from the Tarpeian rock, and was only frustrated in this attempt by the veto of another tribune (Plin. vii 143). Very trivial interferences with tribunes were frequently treated as treason against the nation ('*perduellio*' or '*maiestas*'). The concentration of this '*sacrosanctitas*' on one person was afterwards an essential element in the imperial system.

368. The '*interregnum*' ensued when there was a failure, for any reason, to elect new consuls before the old ones went out of office, or when some mischance, such as death or resignation, left the State without its proper chiefs. In that case the other magistrates resigned and the patrician members of the Senate nominated a patrician '*interrex*' (§ 334) who, after five days, nominated another; and so on, until elections were brought about. The business of the '*interrex*' was to set the machinery of State going again as soon as might be, and not until the late Republican time, when obstructive tactics grew shameless, did '*interregna*' of long duration occur.

Their sacrosancta potestas.

interregnum.



369. Some minor functionaries need brief mention. The 'uigintisexuiri' included the 'tresuiri capitales', first appointed in 289, who were subordinate police magistrates, the mintmasters, 'tresuiri aere argento auro flando feriundo', four commissioners for cleansing roads within the city, and two for keeping in order those outside, the 'decemuiri stlitibus iudicandis' (§ 326), and the four 'praefecti Capuam Cumas'. These last administered justice as representatives of the praetors in the 'ciuitates sine suffragio', and continued to do so after those communities acquired the full franchise; hence these towns were called 'praefecturae'. These praefecti appear to have been nominated by the praetor down to the Gracchan age, when they were elected by the 'comitia tributa'. For the so-called 'centumuiroi' see § 459. The Senate supplied from its own body 'legati' who filled many gaps in the scheme of government, especially in the domain of foreign affairs, as envoys for all purposes, and in that of military and provincial administration, as chief staff officers to the commanders and governors. At the end of the Republic the senatorial 'legatus' had become the ordinary commander of the legion. Of other officers appointed for special purposes may be mentioned the commissioners for founding each separate colony ('tresuiri coloniae deducendae'), the officers who allotted lands under agrarian measures, and the 'duouiri nauales' who, from 311 to about 180, had the duty, not of commanding at sea, but of keeping the fleet in good order.

Minor functionaries.

370. The Senate, as we have seen, was the great unifying and regulating force in the constitution. From the close of the conflict between patricians and plebeians to the advent of Ti. Gracchus, it was not merely an advisory, but a real governing body, determining how countless details of administration should be managed. That such a huge Committee should have succeeded in managing so well the affairs of a great power, is the chief of many marvels in Roman constitutional history. Here again the explanation lies in the contradiction between theory and practice, which pervaded the Roman polity at the time, and in the reverence, rarely broken, for established custom. Decisions generally depended on a few members of the greatest experience, those who had passed the consulship ('consulares'). During the period in question, dissensions rarely arose on questions of principle, but rather sprang from personal rivalries, which were not pushed to the extent of endangering the stability of the State.

The Senate.

371. The supremacy of the Senate was exhibited chiefly in three fields, those of legislation, of foreign affairs, and of finance. War and peace required the assent of the 'comitia centuriata'. But the occasions on which it was withheld contrary to the opinion of the Senate (as when the first proposal was made to attack Philip on the conclusion of the Hannibalic war) were so few, that ancient writers often omit to mention it. An act of an assembly was needed to create a formal 'foedus' between Rome and a foreign people. But innumerable compacts of a less formal kind were arranged and acted on during long periods. Thus an informal agreement, accepted by the Senate, regulated the intercourse between Rome and Gades, from the time when the Romans first came into contact with the city, until Gades received the Roman franchise from Caesar. The status of whole provinces sometimes depended on conditions laid down by governors, under direction of the Senate, and accepted by the provincials, but never submitted to a Roman assembly

Its supremacy in legislation, foreign affairs,

(‘leges datae’). Such was the nature of the ‘lex Rupilia’, or ‘leges Rupiliae’, the fundamental charter of Sicily, to which Cicero constantly refers in his speeches against Verres. For the innumerable compacts made by Pompey in the East the sanction of the Senate was alone sought in the first instance. The interference of the comitia with foreign arrangements marks the decrepitude of the Republic. The Senate kept in close touch with foreign affairs through members of its own, the ‘legati’, who acted as envoys for all purposes. The control of the Senate over provincial administration was of course paramount.

372. Again, in all administrative questions connected with revenue

and expenditure, the voice of the Senate was supreme.

Finance.

Many large matters of finance were managed by the censors, in a somewhat haphazard fashion (§ 364). There was nothing that could be called a ‘Budget’, that is to say, a careful periodical estimate of income and outgoings. Direct collection of taxes by public officials was unknown. The valuation of citizens’ possessions by the censors was not needed for purposes of taxation after 167, when the ‘tributum’, consisting of a fraction, usually one-thousandth part, of a citizen’s whole property, ceased to be levied. The registration of property continued, but was only required for the centurial classification, and possibly (after the time of C. Gracchus) for the register of the equites. The only tax still imposed upon citizens was the ‘uicēsima manumissionum’, a tax of five per cent. on the value of manumitted slaves, created by a lex Manlia in 357. The expenses of government were met from the provincial imposts, the customs dues (‘portoria’), and the income produced by national possessions, the ‘publicus ager’, mines, forests and the like. The intrusions of the comitia into the direction of finance characterise the last years of the Republic. The so-called ‘First Triumvirate’ may not unjustly be regarded, in one of its aspects, as a conspiracy for plundering the Treasury.

373. Of the other multifarious activities of the Senate, little can here

be said. It exercised a general supervision over religion, and property connected with it. The priests acted under

Other duties  
of the Senate.

Senatorial direction, as technical advisers, with practically no power of initiative. Army administration also fell within the purview of the Senate, but it rarely interfered with the tactics or strategy of the commanders in the field. An exceptional case is the direction given to the consuls of 216 to bring about a decisive engagement with Hannibal. But the Senate marked out the ‘prouinciae’, and sometimes influenced their allotment to particular magistrates, who had the technical right to resort to the lot (§ 358). Yet, in the great age of Senatorial ascendancy, popular pressure was sometimes too powerful for the Senate, even in this department of affairs. Thus, what would now be called a ‘humanitarian’ agitation, roused by the cruelties practised at Syracuse by the great Marcellus, caused the cancelling of a second commission given to him to conduct the war in Sicily.

Certain powers which had belonged to the comitia fell, in course of time, into the hands of the Senate. For instance, the 'prorogatio imperii' (§ 338), whose very title implies an original resort to the assembly. So too with the 'solutio legibus', or relaxation of certain statutory limitations, in favour of individuals, a privilege which remained to the Senate in the earlier imperial age. A similarly usurped power was that of appointing a man like Pompeius to conduct war, though he had never held office, and was legally 'priuatus'. Of the criminal commissions issued by the Senate and of the 'Senatus consultum ultimum' mention has been made above (§§ 340, 345).

374. A trace of the original subordination of the Senate to the executive is to be seen in the fact that senators were not free to initiate business. No valid resolution could be carried unless it referred to matters about which advice was asked by the president, who was said 'referre rem ad senatum'. The president could refuse to put any motion, or any part of a motion, which displeased him. But a recalcitrant could be controlled by means of the tribunes, who might summon the Senate themselves, and bring forward the obstructed proposals. The threat of such a procedure was generally sufficient. And nothing could prevent a senator from delivering himself on any matter whatsoever, since the debates were conducted without any rule of relevance. The anecdote about Cato, that for years he tacked on to the end of every speech the utterance 'ceterum censeo delendam esse Carthaginem', is familiar<sup>1</sup>. Nor was there any limit to the length of speeches. Obstruction by prolixity was frequent. It was not difficult to stave off decisions by speaking till sundown, when sittings ended automatically. Cato of Utica was distinguished for his power 'eximere diem dicendo', as the phrase ran. The final form of a 'senatus consultum' was determined by a small committee, whose names were recorded in it, with the introductory words 'scribendo arfuerunt'. It has sometimes been denied that all senators had the right to speak in the Senate, because certain of them were known as 'pedarii', and this has been taken to mean that they only used their feet in voting ('pedibus ire in sententiam') and not their voices. This idea is incompatible with the fundamental conception of the Senate (§ 310) and is contradicted by positive evidence. It may be noted, finally, that attendance on the Senate was, in principle, compulsory, and that every senator was required to have a domicile in Rome.

Procedure in  
the Senate.

375. To complete this sketch of Republican institutions, something more must be said of the citizens in general and their assemblies. One weakness of the Republic was the ease with which the descendants of the manumitted slave became full burgesses. Probably by the end of the Republican period, a large part of the citizens were descended from slaves. The taint of slavery was not entirely lost by the freedman's son, but his grandson was

The citizens  
and their  
assemblies.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Plutarch, *Cato I*, 26; Plin. *N. H.* xv 74; Flor. ii 15.

free from all disability, he was, in the strictest sense, 'ingenuus'. A lex Terentia of 189 seems to have confined the requirement of a freeborn grandfather to candidature for the magistracy and membership of the Senate, but for plebeian offices the freeborn father sufficed. The whole class of actual freedmen were 'libertini'; an individual was called 'libertus' only when the name of his former master in the genitive was added. The confinement of 'libertini' to the city tribes was regular, but was often the subject of dispute (§ 312).

The partial citizenship of the 'ciues sine suffragio' or 'municipes', which subjected them to burdens, and gave them only the status of citizens before the law, without membership of the tribes, and therefore without the 'ius suffragii' and 'ius honorum', finally disappeared soon after the Hannibalic war. The partial citizenship denoted by 'Latinitas' had different grades. There was an avenue to the full Roman citizenship by way of the municipal magistracy in the Latin cities. In early days the Latins resident at Rome, or some of them, could vote in the 'comitia centuriata' in a century determined by lot (Liv. xxv 3). Enfranchised provincials were at first debarred from holding office at Rome, but the disqualification disappeared in the early imperial age.

376. The protection of the citizen's liberty and rights depended on two things, the 'prouocatio', and the 'auxilium' of the tribunate. The protection of their rights. The 'prouocatio' is an appeal to the 'comitia' against a penalty imposed by a magistrate beyond the moderate punishments authorised by law (§ 357). Where the penalty affected the citizen's life or status ('caput'), the matter was judged by the centuries; where it touched pecuniary interests only, by the tribes. The magistrate who announced the penalty was prompted by a prosecutor ('accusator') who brought forward the name of the accused ('deferre nomen'), and was aided by 'subscriptores'. The efficacy of the criminal laws depended on voluntary prosecutions, which were in many cases invited by statutory rewards of different kinds. This simple 'delatio' brought with it ultimately the greatest evils. At first the 'prouocatio' was good only within the pomerium and one mile beyond. The leges Porciae, passed in the second century B.C., formed a charter for the Roman civilian, in the later Republican time, in whatever part of the empire he might be. The scourging of the Roman citizen ('uerberatio') was absolutely forbidden, and the cry 'ciuis Romanus sum' entitled him to a trial at Rome. To some extent, the 'prouocatio' seems to have been extended to the soldier on service, but the evidence is very obscure. That the death penalty continued to be inflicted without appeal is shown by the 'decimatio', carried out by many commanders.

377. After the Hortensian Law was passed in 287, there were no distinct spheres of legislation for the three assemblies. All were equally competent in all matters, and hence it is extremely difficult to determine, with regard to a number of enactments,



what form of assembly was concerned in passing them. One thing is certain, that the 'concilium plebis' became more and more the regular legislative body, and, as a consequence, the tribunes became the ordinary legislators. In practice, the declaration of war and probably the resolution in favour of peace continued to need the assent of the centuries; but the treaty embodying the terms may have been passed at times by other assemblies. There is hardly any other department of legislation which can be shown to have been in any way fettered. Enactments never ceased altogether to be brought before the centuries by consuls, and before the tribes by praetors, though the tribal and centuriate assemblies continually waned in importance. The 'leges tribuniciae' came to a sudden end in 40 B.C., after which legislation proceeded on new lines.

378. The criminal jurisdiction of the assemblies was of course bound up with the 'prouocatio' (§§ 326, 376), and little more need be said of it. A trial, whether before the centuries or before the tribes, went through four hearings. The magistrate who had inquired into the matter, named the day for the first hearing, and was said 'diem dicere', a phrase which is sometimes also applied to the prosecutor. In fixing the second and third hearings he was said 'diem prodicere'. Between the third and the fourth hearing ('quarta accusatio'), when the final vote was taken, 24 days ('trinum nundinum') had to elapse. If an adverse verdict was given, affecting life or status ('caput'), the plea was always put in, that the culprit had 'changed his soil with a view to exile' ('exilii causa solum uertisse'), that is to say, that he had ceased to be a citizen, and then followed 'aqua et igni interdictio' (§ 483). It was a maxim of early Roman criminal law that a punishment could not extend both to a man's 'caput' and his property, in other words that 'poena' and 'multa' should not be conjoined. But there were some exceptions to this rule in the Republican time, as in the case of 'perduellio', when confiscation followed. In the imperial period the rule was abandoned. When the 'quaestiones' came into existence, the criminal procedure was not essentially changed.

Criminal  
jurisdiction.

379. We resume the historical exposition of constitutional development. The domination of Caesar, like that of Sulla, was an absolutism, professing to derive authority from law. Any use that was made of ancient constitutional forms depended on the will of the ruler. Caesar shook down the tottering fabric of the Republic. To describe him as the founder of the Empire is an error, for he bequeathed to Augustus rather warnings than examples. Such anticipations as he made of the coming imperial system will be described below.

Constitutional  
development  
resumed:  
The domina-  
tion of Caesar.

380. The period which lies between the 15th March, 44, the date of Caesar's murder, and the 27th Nov. 43, when the Triumvirs entered on their rule, is one of complete chaos, when even the constitutionalists were driven to govern in defiance of ancient law and custom. The rule of the Triumvirs was

From the  
death of  
Caesar to the  
second Trium-  
virate.

again a nominally legalised tyranny, on lines similar to those which had been laid down by Sulla and Caesar. The law which established the Triumvirate gave its holders power for five years from 1 Jan. 42; whether the power was formally renewed by another law for a further period has been disputed, but is immaterial. Some doubt exists

as to the nature of the authority which Octavian wielded from 32 until the 13th Jan. 27, when he professed to surrender into the hands of the Senate all the powers which he possessed. The consulship which he held year after year, the special war-commission against Antonius, together with many other enactments for particular purposes, covered the ground pretty completely. According to Cassius Dio, Augustus cancelled in the year 28 all measures taken by him as Triumvir; but the information is obviously incomplete. In his 'monumentum Ancyranum' (c. 34) Augustus, after having described his power as unlimited, by universal consent ('per consensum uniuersorum potitus rerum omnium') says that he placed the commonwealth at the disposal of the Senate and Roman people ('rem publicam ex mea potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli'). But he prefaces this statement with a reference to two years, those of his sixth and seventh consulships (28 and 27). Other evidence makes it clear that the middle of January B.C. 27 marked an epoch in Roman history, and that then Octavian entered in earnest on his huge task of organising the new imperial system. It seems more than doubtful whether the control over the army was even momentarily abandoned. The above-mentioned surrender on the part of Octavian was followed by a law entrusting him with imperial powers. We cannot tell precisely how the powers were defined. But it is certain that the sole supreme command over the army was assured, and this is the essential kernel of the imperial authority. It was symbolised by planting the laurel-trees in front of the door of the emperor's palace. The name 'imperator' became a kind of imperial

praenomen, preceding the emperor's other designations. This praenomen of 'imperator' had been already so used by Caesar and by Octavian himself. The law which conferred this military command also probably transferred to its possessor the old rights of the 'comitia' to decide on questions of peace and war, but this privilege may have been given in 23. An important consequence of the concentration of military authority was the organisation of the 'cohortes praetoriae' who play such an important part in the imperial drama. This was a large development of the old 'cohors praetoria' which formed the escort of every Republican general. Until the time of Septimius Severus, the old principle was maintained that no part of the legionary army could be stationed in Italy. In the same month of January 27, the celebrated division of the provinces between the emperor and the Senate was carried out. The Senate retained for the most part the older provinces, where its rule was familiar to the inhabitants, while the emperor governed in the

The name  
'imperator'.

main the newer and less settled portions of the Empire, which needed the presence of a military force. All soldiers owed allegiance to the emperor alone, and Africa was the only senatorial province in which a detachment of the army was stationed. The grant of power made in 27 was renewed periodically down to the time of Augustus' death.

381. When the arrangement of 27 was made, the new name of Augustus was given to Octavian, and it became the special designation of the emperors ever after. In 23 a new departure was taken. Hitherto Augustus had been consul, year after year. He had been careful to avoid making any use of the title of dictator, which Caesar had rendered odious, and which even his lieutenant Antonius had abolished by law, after the assassination. Augustus found it inconvenient to rest any part of his authority on the consulship, and replaced it by the 'tribunicia potestas' which he held for the remainder of his life. This became a vital part of the imperial authority. All the old powers of the Tribune were thereby vested in the emperor. He did not assume the office of tribune, but all the actual tribunes were subjected to his control. We are told that the 'tribunicia potestas' had already been conferred on Caesar, and on Augustus himself in 36; but apparently no attempt had been made by either to draw direct political consequences from its possession. It had, however, rendered Caesar and his heir 'sacrosancti', after the precedent of the tribunes; and the ascendancy of the tribunes had in the main flowed from their personal inviolability. All treason was now treated as treason against the emperor's person, and all loyalty was loyalty to him.

The new  
name,  
Augustus.

The tribunicia  
potestas.

382. Some authorities relate that the 'proconsulare imperium' was also granted to Augustus in 23. It was more probably involved in the changes which were made four years earlier, but it may have been now re-defined. Its importance was that it gave the emperor a hold on the senatorial, as well as the imperial provinces. Pompey had exercised a kind of 'proconsulare imperium' under the lex Manilia, which had given him, within certain territorial limits, equal powers with a number of provincial governors. But the emperor enjoyed 'proconsulare imperium maius'. Other privileges were conferred on Augustus during his reign, yet they did not to any great extent add to the strength of his position, with one exception. On the death of Lepidus, he obtained the office of 'pontifex maximus', which remained an appanage of the emperors, and enabled them to keep in close touch with the religion of the State.

proconsulare  
imperium  
maius.

the death of

pontifex  
maximus.

383. It is often said that the imperial power consisted of these two elements, the 'proconsulare imperium' and the 'tribunicia potestas'. It is true that every emperor possessed both. The first was conferred by the Senate, and the second was bestowed by a sham assembly of the people. Even at a late date we hear of the 'comitia tribuniciae potestatis'. On this sham rested

The basis of  
the imperial  
power.

the assumption by which the late lawyers justified absolutism. They said that the people had surrendered all their rights to the emperor. The titles of these two great sources of authority were useful to the founder of the Empire, as they linked up the new order with the ancient history of the nation, and so eased the passage from a disorderly liberty to an ordered subjection. The name 'tribunicia potestas' constituted a claim on the part of Augustus to be a true representative of the great democratic leaders of the past, and it was an indication that the welfare of the poorer citizens was to be a principal object for the new line of rulers. But it is impossible to trace every imperial act to one or other of these sources. The emperors themselves seldom troubled to distinguish between the sources of their authority, and from time to time new enactments added new functions. The power of the emperor was in practice treated as a thing indivisible, and for it the commonest designation was 'imperium'. The question has been raised whether the emperor did not possess an 'imperium' which was distinct from the 'proconsulare imperium' and was indicated by the praenomen 'imperator'. Technically, this view may be correct; practically, it is of little importance. The title most commonly assumed by Augustus and his early successors was 'princeps', *i.e.* 'first citizen', but this did not appear in formal documents.

The title  
princeps.

384. Mommsen introduced the term 'dyarchy' to denote the constitution established by Augustus. The word is deceptive, as the new order never, from the first, rested on an equal division of power between the Senate and the emperor.

The supposed  
'dyarchy'.

Though the emperor could boast that he had destroyed no Republican institution, yet, at every point in the vast sphere of government, his superiority was amply secured. That Augustus regarded himself as a magistrate bound by law, is true. But Mommsen's dictum that the emperor was "only one magistrate the more" is nevertheless misleading. The course of imperial history shows an inevitable trend towards autocracy, which was completely established by Diocletian and Constantine. There was very little in the tyranny of a Gaius or a Nero which could be said to contravene the principles of the constitution. And even wise rulers like Nerva and Trajan, whose subjects felt their regime to be one of 'liberty', placed the whole government under a personal pressure far beyond that to which Augustus had subjected it. For the Augustan constitution a less misleading name is that of 'Principate'.

385. We will now show in outline how the changed polity affected the magistrates, the Senate, the comitia, the citizens, and the Empire at large. With few exceptions, all the functionaries of the Republic were retained, but the shadow of the emperor was over them all. From what has been already

Influence of  
the changed  
polity on the  
tribunes,

said, it will be seen that the tribunes played but a petty rôle in the new political drama. Their old privileges, excepting that of legislation, were not taken from them, but could only be exercised by the emperor's



permission, and they soon ceased to be of any political importance. For a time their activity in supervising the administration of the law remained. But in the second century their office was only an antiquarian survival, and after that nothing but a name, which lasted into Byzantine times, and was curiously revived by Rienzi. In more than one way the aedileship and the tribunate were closely connected. One or other of these offices had to be passed between the quaestorship and the praetorship. The consulate became more and more of an honorary office, the consuls, held for the most part on a short tenure of six or even two months. Yet the consul's sphere of operations was somewhat enlarged. His powers of jurisdiction were more extensive than they had been under the Republic. And he shared in the increased business which, as we shall see, was allotted to the Senate. Ex-consuls and ex-praetors still the praetors, supplied the governors for senatorial provinces. The number of praetors varied from Caesar's time to that of Claudius, and rose to eighteen. The old business of the praetors was insufficient to occupy so numerous a body, but many found employment in the imperial service. The ancient occupations of the praetors were in a good many ways curtailed. The administration of the civil law was encroached upon by the emperor himself, by the consuls, by a new officer, the 'praefectus urbi', who had an ancient name (§ 311) but a new position, and became one of the most important functionaries in the empire, and also from Hadrian's time, by 'iuridici' who administered justice in the country parts of Italy. Some new duties were given to the praetors, as, for a short time, the superintendence of the aerarium and (permanently) the 'cura ludorum', which had belonged to the aediles. The censors, in the old Republican sense, ceased to exist, though Claudius and the Flavian emperors bore the title.

Caesar added two to the number of the aediles, with the title of 'aediles cerialēs', to look after the corn supply. Other the aediles, arrangements were made for this duty by Augustus, but the aediles were retained. In the great reorganisation by Augustus of the police of the city, the aediles found a place. From his time to that of Hadrian, each of the fourteen regions into which the city was divided had an administrator who was assigned by lot from among praetors, aediles and tribunes. But police functions were more and more absorbed by new officers, the 'praefectus urbi' and the 'praefectus uigilum', and the aediles disappeared early in the third century. The number the quaestors. of quaestors was raised by Caesar to forty but again reduced by Augustus to twenty. The office still continued to be the gate by which the Senate was entered, but like others, its importance decreased. It existed still in the scheme of government framed by Diocletian and Constantine.

The 'Vigintisexuiri' (§ 369) were reduced by Augustus to 'Vigintiuiri', by the suppression of the two commissioners who looked after roads

outside the city, and of the four 'praefecti Capuam Cumas' (§ 369).

The Vigintisexuiri.

Augustus required that one of these twenty offices should be held before the quaestorship. As the quaestors were twenty in number, the normal thing was for a man to pass straight from the vigintivirate to the quaestorship, and the election to the first office carried with it election to the second.

The cursus honorum regulated by the emperor.

386. The emperor had great influence over the composition of the magistracy, and by consequence, over the membership of the Senate. For all offices excepting the consulship, Augustus enjoyed the right of recommending some candidates who should be elected without fail. These are the 'candidati Caesaris', of whom there is frequent mention in literature. By Nero's time, the consulship had ceased to be an exception. Further, it lay with the emperor to test the qualifications of all candidates. A precedent for the 'commendatio' had been set by Caesar, on whom a law conferred the right to select half the magistrates, other than consuls. During most of his reign Augustus followed the ancient practice of going round with his candidates and requesting personally the votes of the citizens at the comitia; later the 'commendatio' was given in writing.

Freedom of election restricted.

387. The old freedom of election was still further cramped. The Senate continued to be, as before, a collection of past magistrates. But it became a close corporation, with a high property qualification (1,000,000 sesterces). Only men whose fathers had been senators, and others who had received the emperor's permission, could become candidates for the 'vigintivirate'. Thus the whole composition of the 'senatorius ordo' depended on the ruler. The impoverished senator naturally looked to the emperor to keep him in his seat by largess. Every year the princeps republished the list of senators and dropped out the names of those who had become disqualified. Every senator was required to take annually an oath to observe the laws and to be loyal to all the 'acta' of the ruler. Those emperors who became 'censors', and all emperors after Domitian, could draft into the Senate a man who had held no office, denoting at the same time the brevet rank which he was to hold. Thus a man was 'adlectus inter praetorios', or 'inter tribunicios' and so on. Or an actual senator could be raised in rank; this process also bore the name of 'adlectio'. The procedure began under Caesar.

The duties of the Senate.

388. It will be seen that the domination exercised by the princeps over the personnel of the Senate was very severe. We proceed to consider how the Senate's actual duties were affected by the new system. After the accession of Tiberius the comitia ceased to be summoned with rare exceptions, and Tiberius claimed that, in setting the comitia aside, he was acting on instructions from Augustus. The electoral functions of the comitia passed to the Senate. More than once, when impending elections led to disorder, Augustus had superseded

the comitia and had himself arranged the selection of the magistrates, and, earlier, the electoral comitia had been completely suspended during the Triumvirate. Only on a few occasions after the death of Augustus did the comitia legislate. A few statutes were passed in the reign of Tiberius, and Claudius passed some so-called 'plebiscita'. The latest comitial enactment was the agrarian law of the emperor Nerva. The 'Senatus consultum' took the place of the 'lex', properly so called, and of the 'plebiscitum'. The emperor in practice, and in a continually increasing degree as time went on, became a legislator, without recourse to the Senate.

Sulla had given the standing criminal courts ('quaestiones perpetuae') a practical monopoly of the criminal jurisdiction over citizens. Augustus, however, established the Senate as a high court of justice side by side with the 'quaestiones'. The offenders who came before it were usually, but not always, of senatorial rank. Cases were introduced by the consul. The Senate also became an appeal court in civil cases arising within its own sphere of government. But neither on the criminal nor on the civil side of its jurisdiction was the Senate unfettered by the princeps. Gradually the 'quaestiones' with the juries lost importance, and disappeared in the first half of the third century.

The almost unrestricted power over finance which the Senate had enjoyed had been infringed by the comitia in the last years of the Republic (§§ 352, 372), and it was continuously undermined after the establishment of the Empire; until, in the third century, it completely passed away. There was bitter truth in the gibe which the historian Tacitus hurled at a senator who proposed to transfer money from the aerarium to the emperor's treasury:—'as though it made any difference!' (*Ann.* vi 2). The control of the aerarium was entrusted to imperial nominees. The new imperial finance was turned into a powerful instrument for weakening the hold of the Senate on the provinces allotted to it for government. And in other ways the influence of the emperor sapped the independence of the Senate in the sphere of its provincial government.

The business of the Senate was conducted under the ancient rules. But, as the possibility of the imperial veto hovered over every transaction which was not matter of routine, and as business introduced by the emperor took precedence, the Senate was naturally anxious to discover the mind of the ruler before venturing to pass any resolution of consequence, and his feeling, whether it was made known to the Senators directly or indirectly, was decisive. The effect of the general timidity and servility of the Senate was largely to extend the imperial authority, which owed much of its growth to the accumulation of precedents.

389. Such is a brief sketch of the altered position of the Senate; but some details remain to be filled in later. Meanwhile we turn to other classes of the community. The equestrian body, now entirely in the hands of the princeps, like the Senate, came to hold an important place in the new imperial service, as we

The rest of the community.

shall see. The citizens lost all political privilege by the destruction of the comitia. The old local tribes finally ceased to exist, excepting as organisations of persons entitled to receive doles of corn in the city. A master on manumitting a slave would often buy out one of the recipients in favour of his 'libertus' and he was then said to purchase him a tribe ('emere tribum'). To the poor citizen in the capital the princeps was an earthly Providence, who assured him 'panem et circenses', bread and amusement.

390. We have hitherto looked at the imperial system from the side of the ancient institutions which it affected. To complete the survey, we must approach it from the side on which it was new. It has been seen, in a general way, how thorough was the grip which the lord of the State maintained on all its departments, but this control must

now be considered rather more in detail. The army had, from the time of Marius onward, become more and more the determining factor in Roman politics. Throughout the imperial period, it was the only real basis on which authority rested. Even the strongest emperors were forced to maintain and increase its privileges. A continually increasing proportion of the revenues was expended on its ordinary maintenance, on exceptional largesses, and on providing for the veterans. The convulsions attendant on the changes of dynasty, which ensued on the deaths of Nero, Commodus, and Severus Alexander, were struggles between different sections of the army desirous of seating their own candidates on the throne; and the subsequent period between the death of the last of the Severi and the ascendancy of Diocletian is one of almost continuous military disorder, in which the last fragments of the ancient Republican institutions were destroyed. The concentration of command in the hands of Augustus had indeed rescued Rome from the chaos in which the Republican scheme had ended, but the difficulty of reconciling the whole army to the rule of one and the same person led inevitably to the destruction of the empire's unity. A frank acceptance of the dynastic principle might possibly have checked or delayed the process. But, in theory, each emperor owed his position to a fresh grant of the imperial powers (§ 383), and no dynasty lasted long enough to become surrounded with a traditional reverence sufficiently strong to resist revolution. The fact that Italy and the older and more settled provinces of the Empire were more and more divorced from actual military service placed them at the mercy of the frontier legions.

391. The subject of imperial finance is, in its details, obscure and difficult. But it is clear that the new finance was a powerful engine for advancing the emperor's power. The revenues from the two new imposts, established by Augustus, the 'uicesima hereditatum', payable by Roman citizens only, and the 'centesima rerum venalium', were ear-marked for his new military exchequer, the 'aerarium militare'. The resources of Egypt were entirely at the emperor's disposal; he stepped into the place of the Ptolemies. The new arrangements in



taxation were such that the emperor had financial interests in every province, senatorial as well as imperial. His financial agent ('procurator') became a concurrent power with the governor in all the provinces and, in fact, a political agent of the ruler, and through him the collection of the old senatorial revenues could be checked and watched, greatly to the benefit of the provincials at the outset. The old system of farming the taxes was restricted and ultimately abolished. The general scheme of finance was such as to place the aerarium at a disadvantage compared with the fiscus, and the discrepancy grew till, under the monarchy of Diocletian and Constantine, the aerarium was little more than the municipal chest of the city of Rome. The claims of the fiscus were, of course, easily made subservient to the worst oppression by the bad emperors. The main evil of 'delatio' was concerned, not with politics, but with taxation. A continuous change in financial administration proceeded from the time of Augustus, and Diocletian completed the process, so that a unified system of taxation was imposed on the empire, and taxes were collected under supervision of the government. An important financial power of the emperor was the direction of the gold and silver coinage, the copper coinage being left to the Senate. The continuous debasement of the currency contributed powerfully to the disorder which Diocletian and his successors endeavoured to amend. (On Finance, *see* further in Part 3 of this Chapter.)

392. One of the great supports of the imperial system was what is known as 'emperor-worship', but it concerns our subject only in an indirect manner. Its oriental and unrepubli-  
Emperor-  
worship.
can character, when Caesar made his precipitate attempt to establish it, was the chief cause of his assassination. Augustus went more cautiously to work, and soon the new cult of the 'diui imperatores' spread throughout the Empire, and became a force which helped to weld together the populations and to secure their loyalty to the ruling power. The cult gave a new semblance of dignity to the Senate. At the end of every reign it sat in judgment and decided whether the dead emperor was to be enrolled among the 'diui' or whether his memory was to be reckoned accursed ('damnatio memoriae'). As the decision really depended on the new monarch, the Senate was forced to deify rulers who, like Commodus and Hadrian, had been odious to it. The cult of the living emperor's 'genius' had also political importance. The oath by the 'genius' became regular in official matters, and a breach of it became a kind of treason, or 'maiestas'. By these new religious or quasi-religious institutions, the conflict between Christianity and the Empire was prepared.

393. The relation of the emperors to the making of law and its administration needs further consideration. The emperor's  
Legislation.
supreme power of initiating business in the Senate enabled him to legislate through the Senate to any extent he pleased. And here it may be noted that action of a kind that was likely to be unpopular, whether legislative or administrative, was in many cases naturally thrown

upon the Senate, who helped to screen the ruler from odium. It has been explained that the emperor's independent decisions on all kinds of matters obtained the force of law, and that this was but the extreme development of the old 'ius edicendi' of the Republican magistrates. Ultimately this became the sole source of law. Different names are given to the authoritative pronouncements of the monarch. The most general title is 'constitutio', under which the lawyer Gaius ranks 'edictum', 'rescriptum', and 'epistula'. The word 'edictum' naturally applies to a general order, not called forth by a particular case; the 'rescriptum' and the less formal 'epistula' would originate in a request for an imperial decision in a particular case. These decisions would profess to interpret law, but would often re-make it, as it has been re-made by judges in all ages. The annual oath taken by the senators to treat as valid all 'acta' of the emperor gave every imperial pronouncement, whatever its character, in some sort the vesture of law. This recognition of precedent contributed powerfully to the growth of the emperor's privileges. A conspicuous proof may be seen in the well-known 'lex regia Vespasiani', which bestows on Vespasian every form of authority which had been exercised by Augustus, Tiberius and Claudius. The law does not recognise the 'acta' of Gaius and Nero as possessing validity; for they had suffered the 'damnatio memoriae'.

Administra-  
tion of the  
law.

In the administration of the law the emperor was all-powerful. His relation to the criminal law has already been touched upon. There was no case, civil or criminal, which he might not determine, if he so chose. This power of course required an allotment of much legal business to subordinates, and new and important officials sprang into existence to cope with it.

394. Certain functions possessed by the old comitia which passed over

The grant of  
citizensh.p.

to the emperor exercised a profound influence on the civilisation of the Empire. The grant of the Roman citizenship was an imperial privilege. On the whole the emperors steadily favoured the extension of the franchise until, by the celebrated decree of Caracalla in 212 A.D., the distinction between Roman and non-Roman was in the main obliterated. The citizenship was spread by grants to individuals and classes of individuals, and by grants to whole communities. New colonies of Roman citizens were established in different parts of the Empire (§ 344). But the number of cities which owed their 'Roman' character to this origin was small compared with that of the provincial cities which received Roman rights, many having passed through the intermediate stage of the 'Latinitas' (§ 341). Settlements of veterans were made on the territory of a good many old towns, both in and out of Italy, and these took the title of 'colonia'; but this was often given as a purely honorific distinction. Commodus even bestowed on Rome the dignity of a 'colonia Commodiana'.

395. Within the old senatorial provinces there were many cities, princes, and peoples, who had been allowed to retain partial independence,

often with immunity from taxation, and often with taxation regulated by compact. There were also princes who were in a sense clients of the Empire, though their dominions did not lie exactly within it. In every case of the kind, the emperor exercised an uncontrolled power of change, freeing from tribute or imposing tribute, annexing, and releasing from annexation, as he pleased. The conditions of the old 'foederatae ciuitates', and the 'ciuitates liberae' or 'liberae et immunes', thus underwent frequent alteration. Among the principdoms, Commagēnē, for example, was annexed by Tiberius, liberated by Gaius and finally united with the Empire by Vespasian. In their early dealings with conquered peoples, the Romans had pursued a thoroughly 'opportunist' policy, never attempting to impose a uniform administration on all peoples alike, and respecting their local prejudices so far as was possible. The strength of the Roman rule rested in no small degree on the large recognition accorded to local liberties. But of course the tendency to unification made itself early perceptible, and it went on with increasing impetus under the Empire. The evolution, however, was natural and unforced. The unity of the system which Diocletian and Constantine completed owed its existence to circumstance much more than to design.

Cities, princes,  
and peoples.

396. The Empire began by allowing a large sphere to local administration. It ended in an all-pervading bureaucracy, whose organisation spread in unbroken lines from the capital and distributed the pressure of despotism to the remotest bounds of the Roman dominions. But the growth of this vast system was very gradual, and its beginnings in the Augustan age were small. Augustus showed great wisdom in linking to some extent the new service of the emperor with the old Republican scheme. He chose the governors of his own provinces almost entirely from Senators. Hence their title 'legatus', to which

Provinces.

'pro praetore' was added. There were a few exceptions in minor or newly acquired districts; thus, for instance, Judaea and Noricum and Raetia were ruled by 'procuratores'. This title, which of old was applied to the agents of citizens, with full power to represent them, was chiefly applied to the financial agents of the emperor (§ 391). The principal procurators were equites, and from this body the princeps drew the largest part of his important servants. The precedents for this had been given by Caesar, whose most confidential men of affairs, Matius, Oppius, and Balbus, had been knights, and by Augustus in the case of his great officer Maecenas, who never entered the Senate. The governor of Egypt was an equestrian 'praefectus', and senators were jealously kept aloof from this realm. (On Provinces, see further in Part 9 of this Chapter.)

397. One of the greatest tasks to which Augustus addressed himself was to secure the city against the turbulence which had accelerated the death of the Republic. The chief guarantee of internal peace was of course the presence of the 'cohortes praetoriae' under one or more 'praefecti praetorio', of equestrian rank.

Maintenance  
of order  
in Rome.

When, in the time of Tiberius, the new office of the 'praefectus urbi' was made permanent (§ 385), there were placed under his command three of these cohorts, distinguished as 'cohortes urbanae'. This force was afterwards increased. This great officer of State was drawn from the Senate, and was usually an ex-consul. Near the end of his reign Augustus created a new force, organised in semi-military fashion, the 'uigiles', ruled by a 'praefectus' who was always a knight. There were seven cohorts, each of a thousand men, mostly freedmen, and they formed a fire brigade, and policed the streets. Their chief was subordinate to the 'praefectus urbi'. But where military force was needed, the 'uigiles' could reinforce the Praetorians, and the 'praefectus uigilum' often succeeded to the post of 'praefectus praetorio'. It has been already noticed that Augustus worked the aediles and tribunes of the plebs into his new system of police (§ 385).

398. All the three officers, the 'praefectus urbi', the 'praefectus praetorio' and the 'praefectus uigilum', acquired in course of time considerable jurisdiction in legal matters. The urban Praefect enlarged his sphere until from mere police offences he took cognisance of larger crimes and encroached on the business of the 'quaestiones'. He ended by superseding them in the third century, when he judged all crimes of importance committed at Rome or within a hundred miles. The 'praefectus uigilum' tried criminal cases of less consequence, arising out of the regular policing of the city. The 'praefecti praetorio' acquired in course of time very large powers of criminal jurisdiction, in the exercise of which they were regarded as the special representatives of the emperor. Ultimately, crimes arising in Italy beyond the hundred-mile line came before them. The rulers of provinces, whether senatorial or imperial, received from the emperor, after the first century, the 'ius gladii', authorising them to punish capitally Roman citizens with certain exceptions, namely Roman senators, whose proper criminal court was the Senate itself, some of the higher functionaries of State, and the decuriones, or members of the municipal councils. These excepted persons came under the jurisdiction of the Praetorian Prefect. He was also the proper judge of military offences. There were in the earlier imperial period usually two 'praefecti praetorio' in office together. As the legal business of the office grew, it became customary that one of them should be a lawyer. Finally, these 'praefecti' ceased to be soldiers altogether. After Diocletian, there was one Prefect for each of the four divisions into which the empire was divided. We may here notice that the emperor might be induced to take any case, civil or criminal, out of the hands of subordinate judges, but such instances were, in the nature of things, rare. The trial of Senators for alleged treason was the commonest proceeding of the kind, and it often happened that an emperor at the beginning of his reign promised that he would rule without shedding blood (*ἀναιμωτῶς* in Cassius Dio); that is to say, he would not arbitrarily put Senators to death.

Jurisdiction of  
the praefectus  
urbi,

the praefectus  
uigilum, and  
the praefecti  
praetorio.



The promise, it is needless to say, was rarely kept. In all matters of civil law, the drift of development was the same as that which has been explained in respect of criminal law, viz. the subordinate judges, to whom the facts of cases were referred by the superiors who laid down the law, were gradually dispossessed, and the same official who determined the law tried the facts. This had been an exceptional form of procedure during the Republican and early imperial period.

399. We have seen that the care of the public peace in Rome and Italy, which in old days had been a duty of the Senate, however badly performed, passed into the hands of the emperor's nominees. The same thing happened with regard to the food-supply of the capital, the aqueducts, the public buildings of Rome, and the roads both in Rome and in Italy. Augustus, after trying several experiments, established, near the end of his reign, a 'præfectura annonae',—a high equestrian office, with extensive powers and a great train of subordinates, and a certain right to judge cases, both civil and criminal, connected with the 'cura annonae'. The other duties just mentioned belonged to the abolished office of the censor, and were handed over to officials called 'curatores'. The control of the Tiber was similarly provided for by Tiberius, who established 'curatores riparum'. The Senate and the old Republican officers retained only a small and constantly diminishing share in the municipal administration of Rome. The police of the seas was kept during the earlier centuries of the empire by fleets under 'præfecti'.

Nomination of  
new municipal  
officers.

400. The organisation of departments in Rome for the management of imperial business proceeded slowly at first, and we have scant information. The early emperors placed freedmen in the most responsible positions. During the reign of Claudius we find three great bureaus, the State Secretariate ('ab epistulis'), the Finance Ministry ('a rationibus'), and the department dealing with petitions of all sorts addressed to the emperor ('a libellis'). The Secretariat was early divided into two sides, one dealing with despatches in Latin ('ab epistulis Latinis') and the other with despatches in Greek ('ab epistulis Graecis'). The tendency of the Empire to split into two halves, a Western half, in which Latin culture predominated, and an Eastern, in which the Greek tradition was dominant, was shown in this arrangement. After the reign of Nero the highest departmental offices fell into the hands of equites. The development of the machinery of government proceeded rapidly as the unification of the Empire advanced, and despotism grew stronger, but the details are difficult to trace. The government established by Diocletian and Constantine was but the completion of a long process of evolution. Only a brief sketch of that form of polity can here be given.

Organisation  
of imperial  
business.

401. In the first place the constitution became frankly absolutist. The Roman people (so the lawyers said) had voluntarily resigned all

power into the hands of their emperor, and all persons and bodies in the Empire were bound to do his bidding. The monarch himself became a kind of Oriental Sultan, who was approached as semi-divine. The last trace of a 'Dyarchy' had disappeared. The Senate was only a dignified survival from ancient times, concerned almost solely with the municipal affairs of the ancient capital. Membership of the Senate became to a large extent a mere honorific distinction. The centre of imperial administration was shifted to the old Byzantium, which became the new Rome. The inveterate tendency of the Eastern half of the Empire to separate from the Western was clearly exhibited in the institutions of the new monarchy. The intention of Diocletian was not to sever the Empire into fragments, but to place authority in commission, with an Augustus resident in the East and another resident in the West, each with a Caesar ready to succeed him. But the scheme could not endure. After a long series of conflicts, Constantine brought the Empire once more under a single rule. It was again torn by conflict after his death, and Arcadius and Honorius, the sons of Theodosius, really governed divided realms, an Eastern and a Western Empire, though a fiction of unity was maintained. The barbarian invasions of the fifth century broke up the Western Empire, and the efforts of the Eastern emperors to reconquer Italy and the West had but little permanent influence.

Diocletian  
and  
Constantine.

403. The framework of government instituted by Diocletian and Constantine was only gradually disintegrated, and left traces long after the unity of the Empire had been broken up. The sequel. The old lines of separation between provinces were broken down by subdivision, and the number of those provinces rose from 45 under Trajan, to 120 under Diocletian. This arrangement testifies to the dread which the rulers entertained of allowing officers, either civil or military, who were far away from the centre, any large measure of authority. All functionaries who were really great were kept in pretty close touch with the Court. And the provincial governors, owing to the intensely centralised character of the administration, were much restricted in power.

403. The vast changes in the army, in the legal and financial arrangements, in the constitution of the emperor's Court, and in many other directions, led to the creation of an enormous hierarchy of officials. The complications in this system of bureaucracy were so great, and the evidence concerning it is often so obscure, that it is no easy matter for any student to arrive at a clear conception of its construction. The intricacy of the system was due chiefly to two things. The jealousy naturally felt by the emperors of high officers of State continually led to the creation of new offices as a check upon the old. The other cause was a genuine desire to combat corruption and secure good government. But this endeavour always failed. Officers appointed to check thieves soon became thieves themselves. The benefit which the

The end.

provincials had gained by the institution of the Empire, with its fixed salaries for officials, and its careful supervision, was lost as early as the third century. But the evils which affected the falling Empire can be no further traced here. The ultimate issue of the system was a general paralysis of society.

The Roman constitution has occupied the attention of many of the foremost scholars from the age of the Renaissance till now. The greatest storehouse of information concerning it is the *Römisches Staatsrecht* of Th. Mommsen, ed. 3, 1887. Of this there is a French translation. Other important works are the *Römische Alterthümer* of L. Lange, ed. 3, 1876; the *Römische Staatsverfassung* of E. Herzog, 1884; the *Römische Rechtsgeschichte* of O. Karlowa, 1885; and Madvig's *Verfassung des Römischen Staates*, 1881. Many valuable articles on separate topics will be found in the English *Dictionary of Antiquities*, in the *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* of Daremberg and Saglio, and in the *Real-Encyclopädie* of Pauly-Wissowa. Useful handbooks are the *Droit Public Romain* of P. Willems, ed. 6, 1888, and T. M. Taylor's *Constitutional and Political History of Rome*, 1899. Many constitutional matters receive careful attention in W. E. Heitland's *Roman Republic* (1909), and in Botsford's *Roman Assemblies* (1909).

Bibliography.

## VI. 2. LAW.

404. In the brief account of Roman Law which follows, regard has been paid to the special aim of the present volume, as a *Companion to Latin Studies*. The attempt is made to select from the vast area of Roman legal history principally those particulars which bear most closely on the reading of the ordinary classical student. There is no language or literature into which legal conceptions enter so deeply as the Roman. The texture of Roman political history is interpenetrated by law to a degree which can hardly be paralleled. There is much both in the development of the Roman State, and in the details of Latin literature (even where it has no direct connexion with law), which will escape the notice of a student ignorant of the nature and history of legal institutions. Not only the selection of legal topics, but their arrangement, has here been made on other lines than those which would naturally have been followed, if the needs of students whose primary interest is in law had been considered. The point of view adopted has necessarily led to the exclusion of much technical matter, especially such as belongs to the legal institutions of the Empire in the post-classical age.

Roman law  
for classical  
students.

405. In the primitive age of the Roman commonwealth (as in all early societies) law, which was to be its greatest mature achievement, had little scope. It was in reality ancestral custom, affecting few of the affairs of the citizen, changing very slowly from generation to generation, and owing its force principally to religious sanctions. We have seen that the constitution of early Rome, with its

The primitive  
age before the  
Decemvirate.

rigid organisation of family and clan, and the supremacy of a privileged political order, left little room for jurisdiction exercised by public officers on behalf of the community at large (§ 303). The barriers of class had to be shattered, and privilege had to be broken down, before law could grow. Very gradually it was liberated from its sacral connexions, which had made it a kind of 'arcanum', belonging to the patrician order and controlled by the college of Pontifices. Of the legal system, if it deserved the name, which prevailed during the monarchy and in the first Republican age, nothing is known. In later days a collection of so-called 'leges regiae' was current, which was supposed to have come down from the monarchical period<sup>1</sup>. Some imagined it to have been edited by a certain Papirius, and called it by the name of 'ius Papirianum'. But it was nothing more than a set of precedents connected chiefly with sacred affairs, the origin of which no one knew, and which were therefore supposed to be primeval. The real history of Roman Law begins with the Twelve Tables. All beyond the Decemvirate lies in darkness.

406. We have already described the course which legislation pursued at Rome (§§ 325—350), and have sketched the powers of the magistrates to whom the execution of the law was entrusted (§§ 354—369). But these matters must now be looked at from a legal rather than a political point of view. We shall be concerned more with civil than with criminal law, since criminal law is much more closely bound up with political history, and so has necessarily entered more into our description of the constitutional development of Rome. In the exposition of this subject, the several topics will be treated in the following order:—(a) general features of the expansion of Roman law; (b) status as affecting the relation of different classes of persons to the law; (c) property and its conditions; (d) inheritance; (e) obligations arising out of contract; (f) procedure; (g) a survey of criminal law, chiefly in its non-political aspects.

407. It has already been intimated (§ 357) that the system of law, which was in operation at the end of the Republican age, owed its existence to the various innovations introduced by the judges, and received by common consent, much more than to the direct interference of the legislature. At this time Roman law was in the main what Bentham scornfully described as 'judge-made' law. The statutes affecting the civil law which are known to have been passed in the Republican age are few in all, though in the speech for Balbus (§ 21) Cicero, after mentioning two such enactments by name, hints at 'countless' others; an obvious exaggeration, after every allowance has been made for imperfect records. During the imperial period the pressure of the law-making power upon the legal system, whether the power were exercised by the Senate or by the emperor (§§ 388,

Subsequent  
legislation.

(a) General  
features of  
the expansion  
of Roman  
law.

<sup>1</sup> Dion. Hal. ii 25; Varro, *R. R.* ii 5, 4; Tac. *Ann.* xii 8; Cic. *pro Rab. perd.* 5.



393), was much more extensively felt. But the looser method of making law was not, and could not be, superseded.

408. Legal administration at Rome was never sharply severed from public administration in other departments; in other words, no clear distinction was ever maintained between magistrate and judge. The creation of the 'praetura urbana' in 367 B.C. (§ 330) was indeed a great event in legal history, but the praetor was never debarred from undertaking other public duties, nor were the consuls ever cut off entirely from legal business (*ibid.*). Authority (imperium) was not split into fractions for separate purposes. The Tribunes of the plebs, who rose to ascendancy in the world of politics, also, by virtue of their 'intercessio', supervised the execution of the law, within limits imposed partly by statute, partly by custom (§ 367). Even during the imperial period, there was no complete severance between legal and non-legal administration. Many orders issued by magistrates other than the praetor were practically legal in character, though not so regarded (§ 357).

No clear  
distinction  
between  
magistrate  
and judge.

409. The great impelling force which induced the Republican praetors, by their edict, to make changes in the law, was public opinion. Whenever a reform was generally demanded, the magistrate made it without dispute. In these matters the old theoretic unlimitedness of the imperium was turned to practical use. So far as is known, the praetor's edict was never subjected to 'intercessio'. Whether this immunity rested on custom or on statute, cannot be decided. The particular changes demanded from time to time were determined by many streams of influence, by which the views of practical lawyers were modified. The political enfranchisement of the plebs led inevitably to legal changes of the first importance. And the gradual weakening of the strong conservative force of religion, which dominated every department of affairs in the early State, quickened the pace of change. The 'ius', which is the secular aspect of law, and the 'fas', which is its religious aspect, were at first closely intertwined, and it was natural that the great custodians of law should be those who were the custodians of ritual, the Pontifices. The solemnity of the words prescribed for judges and litigants was almost as religious as the solemnity of the words which were proper in the service of the gods. It was an irreligious proceeding to conduct legal affairs on days not marked out for the purpose by the college of Pontifices, the 'dies fasti' (§ 113). In this connexion the relation of the word 'fastus' to 'fas' is particularly notable. Varro<sup>1</sup> defined 'dies fasti' as those 'per quos praetoribus omnia uerba sine piaculo licet fari'; that is to say, religious expiation was technically due, if a praetor kept open court on any other days. There are many allusions in literature to three solemn words which could only be pronounced on a 'holy' day: DO, DICO, ADDICO (*e.g.* Ovid, *Fasti*, i 47).

Force of  
public opinion.

<sup>1</sup> L. L. vi 29.

**410.** The power of the Pontifices must have rapidly waned after the publication of the Twelve Tables. Appius Claudius, the famous censor of 312 B.C., and his associate Cn. Flavius, published the Calendar and a list of 'formulae', hitherto kept secret<sup>1</sup>. The story is full of difficulty, but it was universally assumed at Rome that these two struck a heavy blow at the ascendancy of the Pontifices over the law. Yet many traces of their authority survived to a late time. The tradition that a Pontifex should be a lawyer was still alive in Cicero's early days. And, so long as the strong traditional connexion of the family 'sacra' with the family property continued, religious principles must have greatly affected property law.

**411.** The Pontifices in the early age were the 'iuris consulti', or 'iuris prudentes', or 'iuris periti', to whom men resorted for advice in legal difficulties. Later, it was customary for nobles to sit in a great arm-chair in the forum (Cic. *Leg.* i 10) and to lend their aid to all who chose to consult them ('ius respondere'), and an order of experts in law sprang up, which had a continuous history until the latest imperial time. The influence of these interpreters of the law in adapting it to the changing needs of everyday life, was profound. Their function, as well as that of every advocate in the courts, was, in the Republican and earlier imperial age, presumed to be honorary, and fees were barred by the 'lex Cincia de donis et muneribus' of 204 B.C.

**412.** Legal opinion at Rome was to some extent moulded by contact with the systems of other nations. At first the 'ius ciuile' maintained in the eyes of patriotic Romans a scornful superiority over the principles followed elsewhere. But gradually the sanctity which surrounded the ancient forms was dissipated. In the view of the citizen, the practice prevailing in the court of the 'praetor peregrinus', where the cumbrousness and stiffness of Roman methods was mitigated, became desirable elsewhere. A new conception arose, that of the 'ius gentium', imagined to be a set of simple and fundamental principles observed by all nations, and this led to modifications of Roman practice. Still more potent was the idea of a 'law of nature', which Roman jurists adopted from the Stoics, many of the greatest lawyers being adherents of that sect. Nature was assumed to favour simplicity, and the equality (so far as possible) of individuals. The rigidity and exclusiveness of the 'ius ciuile' lost the sanctity which had defended them. A new set of principles, to which the name of 'aequitas' was given, acquired superior authority and superseded in many particulars the earlier law. The older and the newer law were distinguished as 'ius ciuile' (now narrowed in application) and 'ius praetorium', the creation of the praetors. The best intellect of the Empire was devoted to the perfecting of the law in accordance with the new lights. The fruits of centuries of effort were garnered

<sup>1</sup> Liv. ix 40; Cic. *pro Murena*, 26; *ad Att.* vi 1, 8.

in the compilations put together by great lawyers in Justinian's time, under his orders, the *Digesta* (or *Pandectae*) and the 'Codex'.

413. When Rome entered on a career of conquest, she did not at first impose her law on the conquered peoples. But, as the subjects of Rome gradually became possessed of the 'ciuitas' or citizenship, there was an extension of the sphere of Roman law. From 212 onwards, in consequence of the celebrated decree of Caracalla, there was a close approximation to a unified system of law for the whole Empire. But it is a mistake to suppose that, even then, local diversities were completely swept away.

Extension of  
the sphere  
of Roman  
law.

414. The definite legal history of the Republic begins with the Twelve Tables. The doubts recently raised as to the antiquity of the fragments that have come down to us, do not concern us here. After the code was enacted, a considerable portion of

The 'Twelve  
Tables'.

the law remained customary and unwritten (§ 325). But the fact that the chief judges of the community were henceforth bound by the written word to which all men had access, instead of being able to appeal to a secret and mysterious tradition, was of the profoundest importance. Until the end of the Republican period, the Twelve Tables were regarded as a great legal charter. Cicero tells us that, in his youth, every schoolboy of the upper classes learned it by heart 'tamquam necessarium carmen', 'as a sing-song imposed by fate'. But he goes on to say that, in his mature years, boys had ceased to acquire it, because it had been supplanted in importance by the 'praetor's edict' (*Leg. ii* 59). Yet, before this eclipse took place, the law of Rome ('ius ciuile', as opposed to the law of other nations) had been so far developed that the orator Crassus (in *Cic. De Or. i* 197) speaks of all other national systems as contemptible when set beside the Roman. In its early days, the praetor had professed only to interpret the Twelve Tables and the customary law. But the legal interpreter becomes of necessity a changer of the law. Each praetor urbanus was theoretically independent of his predecessors, and it is technically correct to speak of 'praetoris edicta' rather than 'praetoris edictum'. But, in fact, change proceeded slowly, and each praetor's proclamation consisted mainly of what he took over from his predecessors ('pars tralatitia'). The natural growth of the so-called 'edictum perpetuum' was stopped by Hadrian (§ 357).

The 'praetor's  
edict'.

415. The division between the citizen and the alien was of course fundamental. Only the 'ciuis' had the unrestricted benefit of the whole law. In this respect the 'ciues sine suffragio', so long as they lasted, were probably on the same footing with the ordinary citizens. But 'peregrini' might have partial benefit, varying in accordance with the compacts which existed between Rome and communities outside. In later law the distinction was partly broken down by the use of fictions. So long as the forms of the 'ius ciuile' continued

(δ) Status in  
relation to  
law.

rigid, the right known as 'commercium' or 'ius commercii', which the Latins possessed, was of much consequence. It authorised the acquisition of property and the making of bargains by Roman methods, and completely assured the protection of the Roman courts. The 'commercium' was therefore no mere permission to trade. As forms of law were simplified, this right lost much of its original importance. The Latins for the most part had the privilege, which other aliens did not possess, of inheriting property from Romans and instituting Romans as heirs; some had also the 'conubium' or 'ius conubii', permitting valid marriages with Romans, from which many legal consequences arose. The judges called 'recuperatores' seem originally to have dealt with cases in which Romans were concerned with foreigners (§ 460). The old legal name for an alien was 'hostis', and an appointment with an alien in a matter of law ('status dies cum hoste' in Cic. *Off.* i 37) was accepted as a valid excuse for absence from other duties. A new class of Latins, called 'Latini Iuniani', came into existence by virtue of the *lex Iunia Norbana* of 19 A.D. These were freedmen and their descendants, who, instead of becoming 'cives', as by the older forms of manumission, were classed as 'Latini'; though their rights were in several respects inferior to those of other 'Latini'. Indeed, Mommsen defines their status as 'qualified slavery'. By the *lex Aelia Sentia* of 4 B.C. slaves who were of bad character passed, when manumitted, into a class entitled 'dediticii', which was under exceptional disabilities. The name was adopted from the title formerly given to Roman subjects who, like the Lucanians and Bruttians in the Hannibalic war, had surrendered without stipulations, and had to be content with any rights which the Government chose to leave to them.

416. Differences of status, in the eye of the law, among those who were all in some sort 'cives Romani' were of many kinds. The full citizen, without losing his citizenship, might pass under a cloud, permanently or temporarily, and thereby be placed at a certain disadvantage, if he became involved in a dispute before the courts. The legal personality of a Roman who became prisoner of war was in abeyance, but was revived, when he obtained his freedom, by what was called the 'ius postliminii' (Cic. *De Or.* i 182; ii 137). The citizen enslaved for debt was in a similar position. And 'infamia' or 'ignominia', which might accrue in many ways, placed a citizen under legal disabilities. The phrase 'deminutio capitis' denotes certain changes of status. When freedom was lost, the 'deminutio' was 'maxima'; when citizen rights were taken away, it was 'media'; and 'minima', when family status alone was affected, as by adoption.

The freedman was not on the same footing as the freeborn ('ingenuus'), nor the bankrupt as the man of unimpaired credit, nor the soldier on service as the civilian. There were other inequalities, of which the most important arose directly from the constitution of the family. In the early ages, the legal position of wife, children and slaves, in relation to the

Varieties of  
status.



'paterfamilias' was the same. Many traces of this condition survived to a late date. For example, any property which the head of the family, of his grace, allowed either son or slave to hold, was denoted by the same phrase in both cases, 'peculium'. And scattered instances occur, late in the Republican era, in which the 'paterfamilias' inflicted death on wife or son, as he would on a slave. In course of time, the law interfered between the head and the members of the family, and partially protected them (even the slaves) against the extreme exercise of authority, both over their persons and their 'peculium'. The pay of the soldier who was 'filiusfamilias' came to be called 'peculium castrense', and, in the imperial age, the father had no control over it, and so with money earned in the service of the Court ('peculium quasi-castrense'). The mastery of the head over his children is 'patria potestas', over his wife 'manus'. As owner of his slaves he is 'dominus', as protector of his freedmen 'patronus'. It is curious that the wife was more commonly designated as 'matrona' (a term obviously correlative with 'patronus'), than as 'materfamilias'.

417. The effect of marriage on the status of the wife changed greatly in course of time. In the patrician State, marriage was constituted by a religious ceremony called 'confarreatio', that is, bride and bridegroom ate together a sacred cake. The contract could only be dissolved by another ceremony, named 'diffarreatio'. Then a form was introduced, open to plebeians, whereby the husband acquired property in his wife by sham purchase ('coemptio'); then looser forms, until marriage came in practice to depend merely on consent, and to be dissolvable at will. And marriage ceased, as a rule, to convey to a husband the old absolute control over the wife, to which the name 'manus' applied, a term which must at one time have denoted every form of the authority of the 'paterfamilias', as is shown by 'mancipium', 'emancipatio' and other expressions. When marriage without 'manus' was adopted, the wife retained to some extent the status which she had as a member of her original family, instead of completely passing out from it, as in earlier times. The emancipation of the wife was especially promoted by the elaboration of technical rules relating to her dowry ('dos').

Marriage with  
or without  
'manus'.

418. Besides the marriage accompanied by 'manus', there were two other modes by which the head of a family might acquire authority over persons who by birth were not subject to him. One was 'adoptio', a process by which one 'paterfamilias' passed his son out of his own 'potestas' into the control of another. This was effected by a sham sale, which conveyed the son from the old father to the new. Later, adoption could be made by testament. The adopted son was, in all respects, on a level with the son by birth. This had occasionally curious consequences. For instance, when Nero was adopted by Claudius, he and Octavia, the emperor's daughter, became brother and sister, and Octavia had to be released from her father's authority before a marriage between the two was possible. When a man was his own master ('sui

'adoptio'.

iuris'), he could only pass under the 'patria potestas' by an enactment of the 'comitia curiata', accompanied by a religious ceremony with which the pontifex maximus and the augurs were concerned. 'adrogatio'. The whole process was termed 'adrogatio'. The 'adrogatus' repudiated the 'sacra' of his original family ('detestatio sacrorum') and accepted the 'sacra' of the new family. It is clear that plebeians could only have become concerned with this process at a comparatively late date. It will be remembered that in this manner P. Clodius, a patrician by birth, divested himself of his patrician quality, subjected himself legally to a plebeian father, and became eligible for the plebeian Tribunate. Caesar, on offence being given to him by Cicero, lent his aid as pontifex maximus and Pompeius as augur stood by his side.

419. The modes by which the authority of a living head of a family, over children and slaves, might be ended, must now be described. A daughter might be passed completely into another family by any form of marriage which gave rise to 'manus'. Apart from the process of 'adoptio', the father had power to set his children free. A clause of the Twelve Tables lays down that the son shall be liberated, if his father sells him ('uenum duit') thrice. The interpretation of this is not quite easy, but the original power of the father to sell his son into slavery is not doubtful. The ordinary form for dissolving the 'patria potestas', however, seems to have been a sham triple sale, the result of which was that the son was 'emancipatus'. This signifies, usually, the final freedom of the son, but it is sometimes used when the son is not freed, but is passed over into the 'potestas' of an adoptive father. It is this use which enabled Horace<sup>1</sup> to speak of Antony as 'emancipatus feminae', enslaved to Cleopatra. It may be here noted that a son under 'potestas', as well as a slave, might be handed over to one whom he had injured, if the father did not choose to be responsible for the damage ('noxā' or 'noxia') or could not make it good. When one of these is surrendered, he is 'noxae deditus'. Elaborate rules of law regulated the rights of the persons injured by the 'noxā.'

420. The emancipation of the slave was earliest effected by the procedure 'per uindictam'. This was in essence a collusive suit brought before the praetor. A 'uindex' or 'adsertor libertatis' claimed that the slave was really a free man, unjustly detained by the master, whereupon the master allowed the claim. The praetor then laid on the slave's head a rod, called 'uindicta', or 'festūca'. This rod also figured in disputes about property. We hear of an 'ālāpa', or slap on the face, being administered to the slave by his master, seemingly as a parting exercise of his authority. In an amusing piece by Phaedrus (ii 5) a slave of the emperor Tiberius pursues him with petty attentions, in the hope of winning his manumission. The emperor

<sup>1</sup> *Epod.* ix 12.

calls out 'multo maioris alapae mecum ueneunt'; greater service was needed to buy the ceremonial slap on the face. Another method of liberation was for the master to allow his slave's name to be entered on the censors' lists as that of a free man (Cic. *De Or.* i 183). Slaves could also be freed by testament. This was often done for purposes of ostentation, in order that the freedmen might march in the funeral procession with the cap of liberty on their heads, and the deceased thus win credit for his generosity. Freedmen of this class were sometimes called 'orcini' and the name was jestingly transferred to those senators who owed their seats to clauses in Caesar's will (Suet. *Aug.* 35). Looser methods of manumission came later, and on the whole the tendency of imperial law was to favour the extension of freedom. But two statutes, the *lex Aelia Sentia* of 4 A.D. and the *lex Fufia Caninia* of 8 A.D., restricted, in several ways, the power of manumission. It has been shown above (§ 415 f) that after the establishment of the empire the status of the liberated slave might take several forms. But in no case were the rights of the former master completely extinguished. As 'patronus', he could command certain services from his 'libertus', but these did not descend to the freedman's son.

421. On the death of the 'paterfamilias' the links binding the family together were shattered. Sons of full age became their own masters ('sui iuris'). Younger sons were under guardianship ('tutela'), the guardians ('tutores') being appointed by the father in his will. If he failed to appoint, the praetor (or other chief judge, later) could nominate, according to recognised rules. At an earlier time the 'tutela' had fallen to the 'gens'. Daughters of whatever age remained under 'tutela', for the law required that women should never be 'sui iuris'. Every act of a person subject to guardianship needed the express sanction ('auctoritas') of the guardian, in order to make it valid in law. Similar were the circumstances of men who had been declared by the praetor incapable of managing their own affairs, on account of insanity, imbecility, or prodigality. They were subject to 'curatores'. So far as women are concerned, the rule 'mulierum perpetua tutela esto' had lost much of its practical effect by the time of the early empire, when women were in reality as free as they ever have been under any legal system. It was no uncommon thing for a woman to choose her own guardian, and his 'auctoritas' was generally not much more than a legal form. When a wife was under 'manus', her husband could appoint the 'tutor'; otherwise, the 'tutela' was determined by her relation to her original family.

422. For the legal condition of the family, there is a special importance in the terms 'agnatio' and 'cognatio', 'agnati' and 'cognati'. All persons bound together by blood relationship, along with adoptive children whose relationship was fictitious but equally effective in law, were 'cognati'. But of these only so many were 'agnati' as could trace their connexion (original or created by adoption) with each other through males. The 'filiae familias' and the wife 'in

'agnatio'.  
'cognatio'.

manu', who was in the same legal position, were reckoned among the agnates. In the earlier age 'cognatio' was ignored by the law in its allotment of rights, which were all attached to 'agnatio'. Gradually the privileges of the 'cognati' were assimilated to those of the 'agnati', and in the time of Justinian the distinction disappeared. But, for a long period, the 'agnati' were preferred in cases of intestate succession, and in the nomination of 'tutores' and 'curatores'. The 'tutela', as well as the 'curatela', of the agnates was called 'legitima'.

423. We proceed to consider the most important principles touching the law of property and the modes of acquiring it. The earliest distinction between classes of property was that which marked off 'res Mancipi' from 'res nec Mancipi'. The former class consisted of things which were conveyed into the hands of an owner by a process called 'Mancipatio'; the latter class included all other property.

'res Mancipi'. The things covered by the term 'res Mancipi' were such as were most important to a primitive agricultural community, land, slaves, horses, asses, mules, and certain rights belonging to land, 'iura rusticorum praediorum', which will be explained later. It was a quaint distinction, and one not easily explicable, which excluded the smaller animals, as sheep and goats, from the class of 'res Mancipi'.

'res nec Mancipi'. In the expression 'res nec Mancipi', the use of *nec* for *non* indicates its antiquity. As to lands, the early history of landholding in Italy, as elsewhere, is of course obscure. But, in the historical period, only such land as lay within those tribe-districts which constituted the 'ager Romanus' (§ 336) was accounted as 'res Mancipi'. The 'ager Romanus' was ultimately made to comprise all Italy, with the exception of so much of it as was 'ager publicus'. Outside Italy no land was assimilated in law to the 'Romanus ager', unless the community to which it belonged had received the 'ius Italicum soli'. Citizen-colonies outside the peninsula were granted this right, and certain other communities by special gift of the emperors. But non Romans who possessed the 'commercium' (§ 415) could acquire and hold land in accordance with Roman legal forms. The term 'dominium' (absolute ownership) applied in strictness to the 'res Mancipi' only, and these are said to be held 'iure Quiritium', or, in modern phrase, by 'Quiritarian ownership'. The 'res Mancipi' owned by a 'paterfamilias' were sometimes summed up in the word 'familia', other property being 'pecunia'. This contrast is found in a clause of the Twelve Tables. But 'pecunia' often figures as a general term for property.

424. The 'Mancipatio' by which 'res Mancipi' were transferred was carried out 'by the copper and the balance' ('per aes et libram'). A 'libripens' was present, who originally weighed all the coin paid for the purchase, at a time when coinage was not far enough advanced to make counting sufficient. Later, the money was not brought on the scene, but the 'libripens' struck the balance symbolically



with a bit of copper, the transfer of money taking place elsewhere. There were also five witnesses, and it is a natural but doubtful conjecture that, originally, one was taken from each of the five Servian classes. The whole proceeding became a mere legal form. The same pantomime was gone through, with a sham purchaser, in fictitious sales, such as that by which a son was freed from his father's potestas, or a wife was acquired by 'coemptio'.

425. Although 'nexum' is really a contract, and contracts must be dealt with later, it is convenient to speak of 'nexum' here, 'nexum'. since it derives from 'mancipatio', and is in form an incomplete conveyance which bound one of the parties by word ('nuncupatio') to convey property at some future time. Varro (*L. L.* vii 105) quotes two old lawyers who define 'nexum' as 'everything which is carried on by the copper and the balance' ('quod geritur per aes et libram'), thus including 'mancipatio', and then refers to Mucius Scaevola, who restricts it to the contract; and this usage prevailed. The 'nexum', like the 'mancipatio', was only open to Romans and those who possessed 'commercium'. Probably 'nexum' was at first restricted to 'res Mancipi', but its great historical importance lies in the fact of its connexion with the early law of debt. The borrower bound himself to the lender, to hand over his property to the lender, if he failed The law of debt. to repay the money lent. So long as the engagement was unfulfilled, the debtor was 'nexus'. If the property was insufficient, the creditor might apply to the praetor to have the debtor handed over to him as prisoner, to work out his debt. Originally, the alternative of the sale of the prisoner into slavery was probably permissible. The praetor was said 'addicere', when he handed over either the borrower's person or his property to the lender; and a debtor condemned to suffer in his person is 'iudicatus' when sentence is given against him and 'addictus' when finally handed over to his creditor. He might then be kept in chains ('uinctus'). Hence the curious expression in Livy ii 23: 'nexi uincti solutique' the undischarged debtors, whether bound in chains or not. The severity of the old law of debt plays, as is well known, a conspicuous part in the annalistic story of Rome.

To mitigate the lot of debtors, laws were repeatedly passed, which either forbade extravagant interest to be charged, or abolished interest altogether. But such laws have been in all ages ineffectual. In 326 or 313 a *lex Poetelia* was enacted which seems to have prevented the sale of the debtor into slavery, and did not allow him to be loaded with chains, though the 'noxae deditus' might still be shackled. Livy (viii 28) goes too far when he says that this statute made the debtor's property alone liable for the debt, and a doubtful passage of Varro (*L. L.* vii 105) has been supposed to assert the same view. But we hear of enslavement to a creditor right down to the age of Justinian, though the procedure and terminology connected with it were changed, and its operation was restricted in that age, as compared with the earlier time.

426. The 'res nec Mancipi' were acquired by simple transfer ('traditio') from seller to buyer. They were at first not held by 'quiritarian ownership', and remedies for infringement of rights in the 'res Mancipi' and the 'res nec Mancipi' were different in form. But gradually the law removed the distinction between the two classes of property, and, long before the era of Justinian, it had disappeared. Two principles gave elasticity to the law of property and title; the principle of prescription ('usucapio') and the distinction between absolute ownership ('dominium') of a piece of property, and the right to hold it and enjoy it ('possessio'), a right which might take many forms. As 'possessor', the holder had 'usus' or 'usufructus'. In the end, a large, complicated and difficult department of law came into existence as a consequence of this distinction. The legal remedies open to the 'possessor' and the 'dominus' were not the same. An important application of the idea of 'possessio' relates to the Roman 'ager publicus'. Tenants of this land could only be 'possessores', not 'domini', because the owner was the Roman people. And the same was true of provincial soil, excepting in so far as it had been assimilated in law, by special favour, to Italian soil (§ 423). A clause of the Twelve Tables laid down that the title to a 'fundus' might not be questioned after two years' occupancy, that is to say, if it had been unchallenged, or unsuccessfully challenged, at law (Cic. *Caec.* 54). The holder then obtained the complete title 'per usucapionem', literally, by holding the use or enjoyment of the land. For other property it was sufficient to have held it for one year. In the imperial age the law of 'prescription' was greatly changed and developed.

427. The existence of 'usucapio' facilitated many processes in Roman law. It was often easier and better for one who was really 'dominus' to proceed at law as 'possessor', and if his claim was successful, a full title would accrue to him by mere lapse of time. Many applications were made of 'possessio' in connexion with the law of inheritance, bankruptcy, and other departments. In many instances where the rigid old 'ius civile' would not have recognised a right of property, the praetor declared a holder entitled to keep the property 'among his goods' ('in bonis'), until time operated to give him full title. Hence the distinction between 'quiritarian' and 'bonitarian' ownership, a distinction of far-reaching importance. A peculiar application of 'usucapio' is to be found in the practice by which, after a year's uninterrupted cohabitation, the husband acquired 'manus' over the wife, who was thus treated in law as a piece of movable property. She could evade the result by absenting herself from her husband for three nights in the year. Of many references in literature to the law of 'usus', perhaps the most familiar is in the line of Lucretius:—'*uitaque Mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu*' (iii 971), 'life is given to none in fee simple; all are tenants of it'. One other method of acquiring title may be mentioned, that known as 'in iure cessio', where

a buyer claimed before a superior judge that he was already owner, and the seller allowed the claim. Another example of 'in iure cessio' has already come before us, in the procedure for manumission 'per uindictam'. 'in iure cessio'.

428. Certain limited forms of property are to be found in the 'servi-  
tutes', which are (roughly speaking) 'easements'. When the ownership of one piece of property gave the right to interfere with the enjoyment of another piece of property, the second was said to be in servitude to the first ('servire'), and the first was said to be in lordship ('dominari'). The word 'servitus' is applied both to the right and the obligation. Servitudes were either 'servitutes praediorum rusticorum' or 'praediorum urbanorum', the latter belonging to houses, the former to land. The developments of servitudes were many. 'Servitutes praediorum rusticorum' were regarded as 'res Mancipi' and were subject to 'mancipatio' and 'usucapio' (Cic. *Caec.* 74). Rustic servitudes are such as 'iter', giving a right to walk over a property; 'actus', to drive over it; 'aquaeductus', to carry water over it. Specimens of urban servitudes are the 'right of ancient lights' ('ius luminum'), the right to get rid of water running from a roof ('ius stillicidii'), and the right to support one house against another ('ius tigni immittendi'). The full force of not a few passages in literature cannot be grasped without some knowledge of the law of these servitudes. Thus Pliny (*Ep.* i 3), speaking of a friend's villa on the lake of Como, talks of the lake as 'subiectus et serviens'.

429. We pass on to give a brief sketch of the law of inheritance. The forms used in historical times for making a valid will bore traces of days when the 'paterfamilias' had no power to direct how his property should be distributed on his death. (2) Law of inheritance.  
In some ancient States, as Athens and probably Sparta, the right to devise property by will was never really granted to a citizen who had living children. And the freedom of testamentary disposition was never so wide at Rome as it is in our country now. At Rome, then, in the earliest days it was custom that determined the destiny of the family property. It passed into the hands of those subjected to the 'patria potestas'. All the children, male or female, had equal rights, and a grandchild, if his father were dead, had the rights of a child. The earliest practice was, not to divide the property, but for the beneficiaries to enjoy it in common, as 'consortes'<sup>1</sup>. These were the 'heredes sui' of the deceased, a phrase which long continued to be applied to those who succeeded when there was no will; and their 'hereditas' was 'legitima', i.e. it accrued by the mere operation of law. But, from a very early date, any one of the heirs could demand to have the inheritance divided; he was said 'erectum ciere' (literally 'to summon to a fencing off'), and the suit was 'actio familiae erciscundae'

<sup>1</sup> A notable late example of this practice is given in an account of a family of Aelii, in Val. Max. iv 4, 8.

(Cic. *De Or.* i 237; *Caec.* 19). If the deceased left no 'sui heredes', the Twelve Tables passed on the property to the agnate nearest of kin, or, if there were more than one agnate of the same degree of kinship, to them. Failing these, the property went to the 'gens', but the succession of the 'gens' was practically obsolete in the later Republican age. Unclaimed possessions ('bona uacantia' or 'caduca') went first to the 'aerarium' and after the age of Antoninus Pius to the *fiscus* (cf. Cic. *De Or.* i 176). The old 'ius ciuile' made no further provision for intestate succession. In time, the 'ius ciuile' was condemned by public opinion because it ignored children whom the paterfamilias had released from his potestas, the whole class of mere 'cognati', and the 'agnati' beyond the nearest degree, if the nearest agnate or agnates refused the succession.

430. The praetor by his edict changed the law profoundly, and gave rights to the unrecognised kin. He could not, technically, put any of these into the position of 'heredes', but he could give them 'possessio' of all or part of the estate. And, even after the right of testamentary disposition reached its full development, it was often convenient for the 'heres' to obtain 'bonorum possessio' from the praetor, who could thus prevent a will from being invalidated on grounds that were technically correct, but seemed to him inequitable. There was a 'bonorum possessio secundum tabulas' as well as a 'bonorum possessio contra tabulas'.

Later rules of succession.

The rules of intestate succession became elaborate, in the endeavour to redress anomalies. For example, the rights of a mother who had not been 'in manu mariti', and therefore was not an agnate of her children, received special recognition in the early Empire. Justinian swept away the last traces of discrimination between 'agnati' and 'cognati' and based intestate succession on 'cognatio' alone.

431. The right to make an operative will ('testamentum') existed even before the age of the Twelve Tables. The citizen may have been first allowed to dispose of things which he had acquired, which were not part of his inherited estate ('patrimonium'); that is to say, he was made free to deal with his 'pecunia' but not his 'familia'.

The right of testation.

The title 'heredium', applied to the family land, and especially to the original minimum qualification for the citizenship (two 'iugera'), seems to go back to a time when the testator could not dispose of it (Varro, *R. R.* i 10). We hear of wills being presented twice a year to the special meetings of the 'comitia curiata', which were named 'calata', and at which the pontifices were present. The activity of the pontiffs in the matter is intelligible. It would be their duty to see that the greatest object for which every family existed, the perpetuation of the cult ('sacra') which belonged to it, was not endangered by the will. Little is known of the 'testamentum calatis comitiis', but it was doubtless attended by cumbrous formalities, was perhaps not revocable, and may not have been permitted to plebeians.

Testamentum calatis comitiis.

Another early form of will is the 'testamentum in procinctu' which the



soldier was allowed to make when his 'loins were girded' for battle. It was made verbally, with comrades for witnesses. The phrase 'in procinctu' has many literary applications. Ovid speaks of some of his poems having been written 'in procinctu', amid danger from the sword (*Pont.* i 8, 9). This form of will was obsolete in Cicero's time (*De Nat. D.* ii 9), although later on the soldier on service was free from many restrictions which were imposed on others.

432. The Twelve Tables contained a clause which had an important bearing on testaments, though it is somewhat obscure. It ran 'uti legassit super pecunia tutelaue suae rei, ita ius esto'. In later law, 'legare' means to impose on the 'heres' the duty of passing on to some person a particular thing or sum of money, or right. It can hardly have had a wider meaning in earlier days, and therefore the clause cannot, as has been sometimes supposed, have established unrestricted liberty of testamentary disposition. It may have been connected with the rise of a new form of testament, that 'per mancipationem'. The testator nominally conveyed the property in sham sale, to a friend ('emptor familiae') and bound him to carry out his wishes with regard to the disposal of such property as was disposable by law, on his decease. Apparently this succeeded to an earlier form, whereby the paterfamilias actually ceded the property during his lifetime to the heir. Seemingly the 'emptor familiae' was bound in honour only, at first, and if he kept faith, would not deal with the property till the testator's death.

433. The next stage was that of the 'testamentum per aes et libram', which has often been supposed to have originated with the plebeian body. Here the conveyance to the 'emptor familiae' is understood to be a formal fiction, and the verbal declaration of the testator ('nuncupatio') is replaced by a written document. The testator affixed his seal to it, and the seven persons present (five witnesses, 'emptor familiae' and 'libripens') affixed theirs in testimony of its genuineness. They might or might not be informed of the contents of the document, which was not opened till the testator's death.

434. All concerned with wills made in these forms must be citizens or must possess 'commercium', and, in legal phrase, such have 'testamenti factio', which also implies the right to take benefit under a will. Certain persons, though they might be beneficiaries, could not make a valid testament; as the mentally incapable, the minor ('impubes'), the deaf and dumb, the 'prodigus' who had been interdicted from managing his own concerns, and the 'intestabilis', who for some disgraceful conduct was incapacitated for many juridical acts. Women were originally disqualified, but the praetor ultimately relieved them from their incapacity. The 'filius familias', as possessing nothing except his 'peculium' which depended on his father's grace, was equally incapable, but in the imperial time money earned in the

'in procinctu'.

'legare'.

'testamentum  
per aes et  
libram'.

Persons en-  
titled to make  
wills.

public service was released from the father's power (§ 416). Finally, the Roman will was cut adrift from the venerable formulae of the 'mancipatio' and the process 'per aes et libram', which the older 'ius ciuile' imposed. Any will, sealed with the seals of not less than seven witnesses who were citizens, was recognised as entitling the heir or heirs to 'bonorum possessio'.

435. The distinction between 'hereditas' and 'legatum', between 'heres' and 'legatarius', is vital. Every valid will was bound to begin with a mention of the person or persons who were to be 'heres' or 'heredes', and the testator was said thereby 'instituere heredes'. The 'heres' stood legally, in nearly all respects, in the shoes of the deceased. He was both beneficiary under the will, and at the same time executor, bound to carry out the deceased's directions, in so far as they accorded with law. The 'legatarius' is a person to whom the 'heres' must make over some particular benefit conferred by the testator. His only concern with the will lies in his claim on the 'heres' for the 'legatum'.

436. A peculiarity of the Roman will was that usually the share to be taken by a 'heres' of the residue, after obligations were discharged, was indicated by the fractions of the 'as'. A 'heres ex asse' takes the whole residue; 'ex semisse', half, and so on with the heres 'ex quadrante', 'ex dodrante', 'ex besse', etc. The testator might name a second set of heirs to take the place of the first if these failed: this was 'substituere heredes', and the 'substituti' were 'secundi heredes'. There might be a third set. To name a person in the second or third place was, of course, nothing in most cases but an empty compliment. But Roman sentiment, far different in this respect from modern, almost required the mention of intimate friends in a will, and the custom of benefiting persons not connected by family ties with the deceased was widespread. This partly accounts for the great prominence in literature of the 'captator' who curries favour with 'orbi' and women. The 'lex Cincia' of 204 B.C. prevented an advocate from receiving a fee for his services. But he was very commonly rewarded by benefits under the client's will. In this way, for example, Cicero acquired considerable wealth. Under the Empire, it was common to institute the emperor as heir, a practice which naturally led to many abuses in the reigns of bad emperors.

437. The rules applicable to 'hereditas' and 'legatum' received great elaboration. Only a few prominent matters can be mentioned here. The 'heres' was of course not bound to accept the 'hereditas'; if he did, he was said 'cernere' or 'adire hereditatem'. For a testator to leave an insolvent estate, and to be unrepresented by heirs to clear his name, was regarded as a great disaster. A curious practice was to institute a slave as heir, the gift of freedom being included. In this way the disgrace of bankruptcy fell upon

'heres' and  
'legatarius'.

'heres  
secundus' or  
'tertius'.

Rules relating  
to 'hereditas'  
and 'legatum'.

the slave. In a well-known letter (ii 4) Pliny places on record his own generosity in bestowing money on an impoverished lady to enable her to accept the 'damnosa hereditas' left her by her father. If 'heredes' failed, the whole will was inoperative. A lex Voconia dating probably from 169 B.C. provided that a testator possessed of more than 100,000 asses should not institute any woman as 'heres', and should not leave to women more than was given to the heirs. This was to prevent property from accumulating in the hands of women. But the provisions of the law were easily evaded, with the sanction, ultimately, of the praetor. No public bodies such as 'municipia' could be named as heirs; but it was possible to 'institute' a god, provided he were selected from among those recognised by the State. A testator could, however, by evasive methods, benefit a public body, and the permission was in imperial times definitely given to bestow legata on such.

438. A 'suus heres' had to be named in the will. He could not be passed over in silence without invalidating the testament. A testator who had a son 'Titius' was bound either to say 'suus heres', 'Titius filius meus heres esto' or 'exheres esto'. And the repudiation of the son would have to be based on reasonable grounds. Otherwise, if he complained that the will was 'unduteous' ('inofficiosum'), the praetor might give to the disinherited son the 'possessio bonorum contra tabulas'; thus defeating the intention of the testator. What has just been said of the son applies of course, in certain circumstances, to others.

439. As to benefits under a will, which were to go to persons other than the heirs, an important distinction existed between 'legata' and 'fideicommissa'. The latter consisted, at the outset, of bequests which were technically illegal; and the heir was only bound by his 'fides'. In this way testators tried to benefit persons who were under legal disability; for example, women affected by the 'lex Voconia' (§ 437). Sometimes a 'heres fiduciarius' would be instituted, who was not intended to take any benefit himself, but to hand over the whole property to a woman or women. Down to the time of Augustus, the 'fideicommissum' was not recognised by the courts. Cicero mentions (*Fin.* ii 55 and 57) a case in which, after consultation with friends, such a 'heres' took to himself the property. But the scandal became too great, and Augustus required the consuls to enforce the 'fideicommissa' against the heirs. Later, a special praetor, called 'fideicommissarius', looked after this business.

440. Care was taken by a 'lex Falcidia' of 40 B.C. that the heir's benefit should not be exhausted by legacies. He was allowed to retain one fourth of what would have come to him, had there been no legacies at all. This is the 'Falcidia quarta'. By a 'Senatus consultum Pegasianum' of 75 A.D. the principle was extended also to 'fideicommissa'. It may be here noted that the 'fideicommissum' is only one example of a frequent practice known by the

'suus heres'.

'legata' and  
'fideicom-  
missa'.

The rights of  
the heir.

general term 'fiducia'. The peculiarity of an obligation of this kind was that, at the outset, it was one of honour. Thus a debtor who passed his property over to a creditor by *mancipatio*, with an undertaking that the creditor would retransfer it on payment of the debt, could not at first enforce this undertaking. Later, he could bring an '*actio fiduciae*', and, if successful, he branded his creditor with '*infamia*', which had many unpleasant consequences. There were many other cases in which property was placed in the hands of a person bound by '*fiducia*' to retransfer it.

441. The rights of beneficiaries under a will were deeply affected by the celebrated '*lex Papia Poppaea*' of 9 A.D., whereby persons not related to the testator by blood or marriage within a certain degree could not take under a will, if '*caelibes*'; and, if '*orbi*', could only receive half. Married people without children were restricted as to the proportion of their property which they could legally bequeath to each other. There were many refinements in practice, and, as bequests invalidated by the law went to the '*fiscus*', there was a great opening for the activity of the '*delator*'.

442. We have next to consider the general features of obligation arising out of contract. One form of contract, of great historical importance, the '*nexus*', has been already noticed. It was in fact, in its form, an incomplete transfer. The metaphor from a chain is obvious in the word '*nexus*'. It is also conspicuous in other legal terms connected with contract, such as '*obligatio*', literally 'a binding', '*vinculum iuris*', etc. Contracts were divided into verbal ('*uerbis*'), literal ('*litteris*'), real ('*re*') and consensual ('*consensu*'). The oldest form of contract at Rome was verbal, and till quite late the verbal contract was held in higher regard than any of the written forms. The earliest shape of the verbal contract was that of the '*sponsio*'. One of the two contracting parties put a question to the other, beginning '*spondesne*', and expressing the matter of the obligation. The other party bound himself by answering '*spondeo*'. If the obligation were bilateral, the operation of questioning and answering had to be repeated, the rôles of the parties being reversed. Special sanctity attached to this ancient form, and it may have been accompanied in early days by a religious ceremony. It enters largely, as we shall see, into legal procedure. It was restricted to citizens, except (apparently) when it was used in public compacts with aliens, such as the agreement made between the Romans and Samnites at the Caudine forks which, according to Livy, was not a '*foedus*' but a '*sponsio*'. The force of this one word '*spondeo*' was great (Cic. *Caec.* 7). It often occurs in literary passages, which cannot be fully understood without a knowledge of its legal history. Thus, in the speech of Palinurus to Aeneas (*Aen.* v 18): '*magnanime Aenea, non si mihi Iuppiter auctor | spondeat, hoc sperem Italiam contingere caelo*', not only '*spondeat*' but '*auctor*' also has legal reference.



443. Subsequently, the verbal contract took many forms, which could all be used by 'peregrini' as well as citizens, and in the end any form intelligible to the parties became valid. The word 'stipulatio' was used as a general term for all verbal contracts. stipulatio. The counter-question is 'restipulatio'. Every 'stipulatio', even the 'sponsio', was free from the cumbrous formalities of the 'mancipatio' and the 'nexum', though of course some witnesses were needed to prove, in case of need, what had been contracted.

444. In the real contracts ('re') the obligation arises merely by the handing over of property. These include two forms of ordinary loan, the 'mutuum', or 'pecunia credita', where the identical thing lent is not to be returned, but its equivalent, and the 'commodatum', where the actual thing lent has to be given back. Other forms of the real contract are the 'depositum', where the money or property is entrusted for care, not lent for use; and the 'pignus', where it is pledged for an advance. 'Real' contracts.

445. The literal contract ('litteris') is of great importance. Public opinion obliged the good paterfamilias to bestow care on keeping his household ledger, 'codex (or tabulae) accepti et expensi (or depensi)'. So strongly was this obligation felt that, in ordinary circumstances, an entry in this ledger would carry considerable weight in a court of law. Cicero found it difficult to quote any example of a man of note who had not performed this duty (*Verr.* II i 60). Literal contracts.

A sort of day-book was also kept called 'aduersaria', 'jottings', and entries were periodically transferred to the formal books (*Cic. pro Rosc. Com.* §§ 5—9). When an entry of money due was made, the creditor was said 'expensum referre' with the name of the debtor; when it was of money received, 'acceptum referre'. Another phrase for entering a debt due was 'scribere nomen', whence 'nomen' came to be a general term for a debt. The allusions to these book-keeping customs are innumerable in literature. In a well-known line (*Trist.* II 10) Ovid speaks of the verses which drew down on him the emperor's wrath: 'acceptum refero uersibus esse nocens'.

A valid contract between two parties was made by entries in the account books of both ('nomen facere'). The technical name for this contract is 'expensilatio'. The old practice of keeping these 'tabulae' died away under the Empire. There were many subtleties of law connected with the forms of literal contract which need not be mentioned here. But it may be noted that, as the Roman national habit of book-keeping had no exact counterpart among foreigners, the Romans, when dealing with them, naturally adopted the separate written document, or 'syngrapha', which had originated among the Greeks, and the use of such documents extended among the Romans themselves as the 'tabulae' went out of fashion. As evidences of contract the books of bankers, important even in Cicero's day (as may be seen from the speech *pro Caecina*), became of increasing consequence.

446. Another class of obligations arose merely from the consent of the parties, properly attested, but without any particular form enjoined by law. To this class belonged sale ('emptio uenditio'), lettings ('locatio conductio'), partnership ('societas') and agency ('mandatum'), which was, in theory, an unpaid office undertaken for a friend. Hence the bitterness of Cicero's taunt against Aebutius, who is described as 'a legal representative of unprotected ladies' ('uiduarum cognitor'), and as exerting himself in that capacity 'cum aliquo suo compendio' (*pro Caecina*, 13).

447. Of course many obligations existed which arose without express contract, such as those which lay on a guardian ('tutor'). Some obligations of this kind sprang from 'delicta'. Thus, theft ('furtum'), robbery ('bona ui rapta'), detriment done to property ('damnum iniuriā'), and personal detriment effected by word or deed ('iniuria' simply), when practised by citizen upon citizen, were not primarily crimes, though violence accompanying them could in many cases be treated criminally.

448. There was a great development of law connected with contract in the imperial age. Particular actions were established for many informal agreements ('pacta praetoria'). The extinction or fulfilment of obligations gave rise to much legal subtlety. Certain 'pacta legitima', which were supposed to have been established by definite statute or ancestral custom, were elaborately regulated. The most important of these was 'donatio'. The liberty of gift-making had been restricted quite early, in 204 B.C. by the famous 'lex Cincia de donis atque muneribus', and the interference of law in this department of life was greatly extended.

449. We have now to deal with the legal procedure by which the rights bestowed by law were protected. Only a few of the most important aspects of this vast subject can be here described. In Roman legal history there are three main forms of civil procedure:—the 'legis actio', the process 'per formulam', and the 'extra-ordinarium iudicium'. These forms of course do not precisely succeed one another in time, the periods during which they were employed overlap. The earliest system, that of the 'legis actio', began to die out probably before the end of the third century B.C.; it was to a large extent extinguished by a lex Aebutia, conjecturally assigned to 131 B.C. but possibly a good deal earlier in date, and again by the legislation of Augustus. But one form of 'legis actio', the 'sacramentum', probably the most ancient form of action at Rome, survived far into the imperial age. The second system, 'per formulam', is characteristic of the later Republic, and the early Empire. When the Empire was established, the third system began to encroach on the second, but did not completely supersede it for several centuries.

450. Our information about the system of 'legis actiones' is largely derived from a passage of the jurist Gaius (iv 11), which is supplemented by scattered references in literature. Even <sup>legis actiones.</sup> Gaius was not clear as to the origin of the expression 'legis actio'. That 'lex' was here presumed by lawyers to refer to the Twelve Tables is pretty certain; but that every form of 'legis actio' was prescribed by the code is unlikely. The whole procedure was probably developed by the college of Pontifices from injunctions contained in the code. The characteristics of the system lay in the precise pronunciation of conventional expressions and the precise performance of actions and gestures in presence of the praetor. A religious solemnity attached to the observance of the prescribed forms. If any slip was made, the case was at an end. We are told that a claimant who mentioned vines by their ordinary name 'uites', instead of the enjoined word 'arbores', failed on that account. And, apparently, no case once brought forward could be handled a second time. There is an allusion to this in a Roman proverb reported by Cicero: 'acta agimus, quod uetamur uetere prouerbio' (*Lael.* 85). This principle was nominally maintained, but often practically violated, under the later systems. The first stage in a suit was the summons by the plaintiff to the defendant to appear before the judge ('in ius uocatio'). The opening words of the Twelve Tables indicated the course which was to be taken, if the defendant declined. The procedure was for long only open to the citizen. To a small extent it was afterwards allowed to the alien. The earliest laws against extortion ('repetundarum') were not really criminal laws; and, under them, the 'peregrini' sued their governor for damages and were permitted to use the 'sacramentum'.

451. Gaius enumerates five 'legis actiones', viz. 'per sacramentum, per iudicis postulationem, per manus iniunctionem, per pignoris capionem, per conductionem'. Of these by far the <sup>actio per sacramentum.</sup> most important was the 'sacramentum'. This 'actio' was the earliest to come into existence, and it outlasted the others, with slight exceptions. The sacral connexion of this procedure, in its early days, is proclaimed by its name; but the exact nature of the connexion is not clear. Most probably the name referred to the oath which each of the litigants took, affirming the justice of his cause. But it was also applied to a deposit of money made by each of the parties. The one who was unsuccessful forfeited his deposit and it was used for sacred purposes. The defendant was required by the judge to provide sureties for his appearance on the day or days when the facts were to be tried out. These sureties are 'uades'; the defendant is said 'uadimonium dare', the plaintiff 'uadari' or 'uadimonium accipere'. This process is not distinctive of the system of 'legis actiones'; it runs through all Roman procedure. In course of time, the oath required of the litigants was dropped, and the deposit was not actually made, but was promised, in case of failure. As

described by Gaius, the 'sacramentum' has assumed the form of a secular wager between the parties as to the justice of their case.

452. One peculiarity of this procedure was that the litigants and the judge were bound to come into contact with the object in dispute. If it were a movable thing or a person, it was brought into court.

Some scholars have thought that the 'sacramentum' was originally not applicable to immovable property; but this is not easy to believe. When a piece of land was in dispute, it was at one time customary that it should be represented before the judge by a clod presumed to have been taken from it. The words pronounced and the actions performed retained traces of an age when submission to the jurisdiction of the court was voluntary. Holding in his hand a rod ('festuca' or 'uindicta'), the plaintiff laid it on the object, saying 'hanc rem meam esse aio' (or 'hunc hominem meum esse aio') 'ex

iure Quiritium', and the defendant made the same claim. This is 'manum  
'manum  
conserere'. conserere', a phrase imitated from actual combat. In a familiar passage of Ennius the two uses, the legal and the real, are brought together.

Speaking of the Romans and Carthaginians, he says 'non ex iure manum consertum, sed magi' ferro | rem repetunt regnumque petunt' (Gell. xx 10, 1 and Cic. *Mur.* 30). The expressions used, in the cases of land and of movable property, were different. Cicero in an amusing passage of the 'pro Murena', where he ridicules the lawyers, gives some of the solemn words employed in a dispute about land (§ 26).

When the statements of claim had been made the judge required the parties to make the deposit, and the defendant to supply his 'uades'. The next step was to decide who was to hold the object in dispute till the

case was decided. Temporary possession is 'uindiciae',  
uindiciae. and the judge was said 'uindicias dare'. Then the holder

had to find sureties for the safety of the property and for any profits that might accrue. These sureties were 'praedes litis ac uindiciarum', where 'lis' means, as often, the matter which is the subject of the lawsuit. The question as to 'uindiciae' was specially important in cases where personal liberty was in question. A person claimed as a slave, whether as being slave-born, or as temporary slave to a creditor, could only resist the claim through a 'uindex', and a famous clause in the Twelve Tables ran thus: 'adsiduo cui adsiduus cuius uindex esto: proletario cui qui uolet esto'. The custom was early established that the judge should decide the question of temporary possession in favour of freedom ('uindicias dare secundum libertatem'). This is conspicuously shown in Livy's account of the trial

of Virginia (iii 45 f). To the 'uindex' the phrases 'adsertor  
libertatis' or 'adsertor' simply and 'adserere in libertatem'

apply; to his opponent the expressions 'adsertor seruitutis' and 'adserere in seruitutem'. The deposit in an ordinary case where 'sacramentum' was used, was either 500 or 50 asses, according as the property was above or below 1000 asses in value. But only the lower sum was required in a case affecting freedom. The allusions to these 'causae liberales', as they were called, in literature are very numerous. In his celebrated epitaph, Verginius Rufus, who crushed Vindex and refused to seek the throne, makes effective play with 'Vindex' and 'adserere': 'hic situs est



Rufus, pulso qui Vindice, quondam | imperium adseruit non sibi sed patriae' (Pliny *Ep.* vi 10). But the elder Pliny (*N. H.* xx 160), looking at the events from another point of view, speaks of 'Vindicem adsertorem illum a Nerone libertatis'. The form of the final judgment on a 'sacramentum' in the late Republican time is given by Cicero where he speaks of a case affecting citizen-rights in which he had been counsel: 'nostrum sacramentum iustum uideri' (*Caec.* § 97).

453. Of the 'legis actio per iudicis postulationem' little is known. It is interesting as showing that at a very early date the magistrate remitted some cases to an inferior judge who tried out the facts. The ceremonies attending this form of action were doubtless not so elaborate or rigorous as those which belonged to the 'sacramentum'. The 'manus iniectio' is somewhat obscure. Its name would naturally indicate a mode of execution, not litigation, and the phrase is so used. It is applied to the arrest by the creditor of the debtor, who is 'iudicatus' or 'addictus'. But the man who admitted a debt could be dealt with in the same manner, and this is conveyed by a clause of the Twelve Tables, which is in other respects not clear: 'aeris confessi rebusque iure iudicatis xxx dies iusti sunt. Post deinde manus iniectio esto. In ius ducito' (Gell. xx 1). Apparently there could be no arrest either of a 'iudicatus', or of a debtor who had confessed his debt, till 30 days had elapsed after sentence or confession. Then (according to another fragment) he was not made over to his creditors ('addictus') until he had been brought into court on three 'nundinae'. Every chance was given to the debtor to procure the means of discharging his obligation. Probably the man who confessed could still, during the 30 days, dispute the debt and bring on a trial which might naturally be said to take place 'per manus iniectionem'. Whether a creditor could, without any formalities, haul into court by this process a debtor who had not made any admission, is not certain; also whether 'manus iniectio' applied to property as well as to persons.

actio per  
iudicis postu-  
lationem.

per manus  
iniectionem.

454. Some other provisions of the Twelve Tables with regard to debt have given rise to much discussion. Thus, referring to a case where several creditors are concerned, we have: 'tertiis nundinis partes secanto. Si plus minusue secuerunt, se fraude esto'. It has been disputed from of old whether this originally referred to a cutting up of the debtor's person or his property. The former process, if it ever existed, must have been early reduced to dumb show. Following on the statement about 'manus iniectio', quoted above, come the following strange provisions: 'ni iudicatum facit aut quis endo eo in iure vindicit, secum ducito, uincito aut neruo aut compedibus xv pondo, ne minore, aut si uolet maiore uincito'. Then a reference to food to be given to a prisoner. It is commonly supposed that there could be no appeal against a judgment for debt, once given. But the words seem to point the other way.

Law of debt.

455. In the case of the 'pignoris capio' the creditor seized property of the debtor, not his person, and before any proceedings at law had begun. He had to pronounce certain solemn words. *actio per pignoris capionem.* But, in later times at least, little use was made of this mode of action. Cicero tells us that 'pignoris capio' was allowed to the 'publicani' against the defaulting taxpayer; and Gellius that when the 'tribuni aerarii' were still paymasters of the army, a soldier could proceed in this way to secure his pay.

456. At a comparatively late date, a new 'legis actio' bearing the name 'condictio' was introduced by a *lex Silia*. As described by Gaius, the procedure consisted in a summons by a plaintiff to appear in court in 30 days' time to arrive at the appointment of a judge to try the dispute. The law applied only to cases of 'certa pecunia', that is to say to money promised by stipulation or 'expensilatio' (§§ 443-5). A subsequent law, the *lex Calpurnia*, extended to the new form 'omnis certa res'. We must suppose that these statutes simplified litigation touching the obligations which they covered, but it is impossible to say precisely in what way this was done.

457. The next subject for consideration is the procedure 'per formulam'. Its principal characteristic is its almost complete separation of the function of the supreme judge, the praetor, who declares the law ('*ius dicit*') applicable to the case, and that of the subordinate judge or judges who try out the facts under an instruction from him. Only in a few cases did the chief judge see through a case from start to finish. The instruction issued by the judge is the 'formula'. To what extent this separation of functions existed under the system of 'legis actiones' cannot be ascertained. That it existed partially, we have seen above. Probably the complete separation was reached by gradual steps. Another characteristic of the formular procedure was its plasticity. New 'formulae' continually came into existence by way of improving, simplifying, and extending legal remedies. These were embodied in the 'edictum perpetuum' (§§ 357, 414). The normal civil suit therefore passed through two stages. So long as it was before the praetor, it was said to be 'in iure'; when it passed from him, the proceedings were 'in iudicio'. The word 'ius' thus came to have a local sense, as applied to the place where the praetor held court. In formal contentious procedure, he sat in the forum, raised aloft in his 'sella curulis', which was placed high on the 'tribunal'. But this ceremony was not always necessary. Some of the less important business could be conducted 'on the ground'; 'de plano', as the phrase was. The application of this expression by Lucretius (i 411) will be remembered: 'hoc tibi de plano possum promittere, Memmi', that is 'speaking as an amateur, and not as an expert'. Jurisdiction could only be exercised by the praetor on the 'dies fasti', the days of open court (§ 113). The lines of Ovid are familiar: 'ille (*sc.* dies) nefastus erit per quem tria uerba silentur; | iustus erit per quem lege licebit agi' (*Fast.* i 47).

Of course 'lege agere' here has a perfectly general sense. The three words are 'do, dico, addico' (§ 409).

458. There were two standing courts of annually elected subordinate judges; the 'Decemuii stlitibus iudicandis' and the 'Centumuii'. The former probably existed from 449 B.C. onward (§ 326). In the later Republic they judged cases in which status (freedom or citizenship) was involved.

Decemuii  
stlitibus  
iudicandis.

459. Nothing is known of the origin of the 'centumuii'. They were elected by the tribes, three from each, who were therefore really 105 in number. Cicero makes the orator Crassus (*De Or.* i 173) enumerate a large number of cases which came before this court, among them those concerning 'tutela', 'usucapio', membership of 'gentes', agnation, and wills, and he speaks of 'innumerable' other things beyond those definitely mentioned. Obviously the 'centumuii' took cognizance especially of cases involving the older portions of the Roman law, the 'ius ciuile' in its narrower sense. That this sphere should be allotted to a popularly elected body is remarkable, and we must suppose that the court owed its origin to some democratic movement of which we have no record. The operations of the court were, in all probability, restricted after the time of Crassus; nevertheless the centumviral body is far more prominent in the first century of the Empire than in Cicero's time. It figures largely in the letters of Pliny, who was proud of his practice in the court (*Ep.* ii 14, etc.). Augustus closely connected the Decemuii with the Centumuii, by making the smaller body presidents of the larger. In the imperial age, as we learn from Pliny (*Ep.* vi 33, 3), the number of the so-called Centumuii was raised to 180, and they were divided into four courts which usually sat separately but could be combined for the hearing of important cases ('quadruplex iudicium' in Plin. *Ep.* i 18). The court is traceable till the fourth century A.D. Its sign was the 'hasta', a symbol of ownership, which figured also at sales of booty by the quaestors, and at the auctions of confiscated property held by Sulla. This is the 'centum grauis hasta uirorum' of Martial (vii 63), and the 'centeni moderatrix iudicis hasta' of Statius (*Silu.* iv 4, 43). Whether the 'praetor hastarius', who existed in the imperial time, was a president in the court, or only remitted cases to it, is not known.

Centumuii.

460. The 'recuperatores' seem once to have been a mixed border-commission appointed to try cases arising between Romans and foreigners, due to rapine or violence. Provision was made in some treaties for the establishment of such commissions. In later times, litigation in which citizens alone were concerned was frequently referred to 'recuperatores', who were named by the praetor for each occasion. Traces of the origin of the institution from international relations remained till late times. Before the first 'lex repetundarum' had been passed, the Senate nominated 'recuperatores' to hear requests from Spain for restitution of property plundered by governors (Livy xliii 2). And sometimes, later, the

recuperatores.

sum to be paid by a man convicted of extortion by a court was determined in this way. And civil cases in the provinces were regularly referred to 'recuperatores'. At Rome, on the civil side of the law, they were employed especially in suits arising out of 'possessio', where the procedure was by interdict, but they are occasionally met with in several other departments. Thus under the Empire they sometimes decided cases of status (Suet. *Vesp.* 3 and *Dom.* 8). But in nearly all instances the suits remitted to recuperatores might, if the praetor so determined, be disposed of in another manner.

461. The majority of civil suits came, however, before 'iudices' or 'arbitri'. These men in the late Republic acted singly, but earlier three or more together, as directed by the 'Twelve Tables'. An elaborate jest on the old 'tres arbitri' occurs at the end of the first book of Cicero *De Legibus*. A trial before a 'iudex' is 'iudicium', before an arbiter 'arbitrium'. Here 'iudicium' is used in a narrower sense than in the phrase 'in iudicio', which applies to all secondary courts. The 'iudex' was appointed, roughly speaking, in cases where one litigant must be entirely right, according to contract, law, or fact, and the other entirely wrong. For example, a dispute about 'certa pecunia' leads to a 'legitimum iudicium'. The 'iudex' administers rigorous law. Where, however, the relations between the litigants are complicated and both may be partly right and partly wrong, an 'arbiter' is needed who may strike a balance and take 'aequitas' and 'bona fides' into consideration. Thus a dispute between two partners naturally leads to an arbitrium, called by the curious name 'arbitrium pro socio'. Cicero's speech 'pro Roscio Comoedo' is concerned with a case of 'certa pecunia', and he there insists on the sharp distinction between the 'iudicium' and the 'arbitrium'. A man, he says, goes into a 'iudicium' to win or lose the whole, the 'iudex' cannot give him a portion. But, in an 'arbitrium', no one expects to get all he asks, and everyone expects to get something; the 'arbiter' considers 'quantum aequius et melius sit dari' (11). Naturally 'arbitria' were very numerous.

462. If the parties agreed on a duly qualified 'iudex' or 'arbiter', the praetor would appoint him. Apart from agreement, the plaintiff proposed a person, and the defendant might object, stating his grounds on oath (cf. Cic. *Fin.* ii 119: 'eiuro inicium'). The praetor decided; and, as time went on, the choice lay more with him and depended less on the litigants. Doubtless in the earlier days the 'iudices' and 'arbitri' were senators, though neither the 'recuperatores' nor the 'decemviri' nor the 'centumviri' were confined to that order. In the later Republic there was probably no formal restriction, though litigants would in most cases choose a man of some standing, and would not often select any one of lower rank than an 'eques'. The law of Gaius Gracchus, which excluded senators from the 'iudicia publica', did not oust them from the 'iudicia priuata'. The iudices in the imperial period were nomi-

'iudices' and  
'arbitri'.

Mode of  
appointment.



nated by the praetors for their own courts from a general list of 'selecti iudices' approved by the emperor, which served both for private and public cases. The duty of acting as 'iudex' was a 'munus publicum' from which exemption ('uacatio') could with difficulty be obtained. This was given by the emperor to individuals; and a lex Iulia of 17 B.C. bestowed it on those who had a certain number of living children. Antoninus Pius freed all members of learned professions, philosophers, rhetoricians, grammarians and physicians. Age entitled to remission. Of course 'infames' were excluded, and the incapable, as the deaf and dumb, and the mentally deficient. The tendency of the Empire, both in Rome and in the 'municipia', was (at first at least) to extend the 'munus iudicandi' to a wider class. For some time the 'iudices' were drawn from Italy only, but largely from the rural districts (Quintil. iv 2, 45); then provincials were admitted (Plin. *N. H.* xxxiii 30).

463. We now propose to survey the proceedings before the praetor ('in iure'), mentioning such particulars as most nearly concern the ordinary classical student; and, subsequently, the proceedings 'in iudicio'. Of course much non-contentious litigation, or sham litigation, began and ended in the praetor's or consul's court. The formal summons into court (always verbal) had to be given to the defendant by the plaintiff himself. The Twelve Tables allowed the defendant to be hauled into court, if he disregarded the summons ('rapior obtorto collo' in Plautus, *Rudens* iii 6, 30). The ordinary plan was to call a bystander to witness that the summons had been given. The scene is vividly depicted by Horace (*Sat.* i 9, 76). The plaintiff there says to Horace 'licetne antestari?' because, in the ordinary way, no one was compelled to bear evidence in a court of law. To rid himself of a bore, Horace allows the plaintiff to touch his ear, as an indication of his readiness to be a witness. Provision was made by the praetor's edict for suits involving penalties against obstruction of the course of justice by the defendant or by others. The defendant, when in court, had to give security ('uadimonia') for his subsequent appearances. If he fulfilled the engagement he was said 'uadimonium sistere' (Cic. *Quint.* 30) or 'obire' (*ib.* 53); if he failed, 'uadimonium deserere' (*ib.* 75). The drawing up of a document for this security seems to have given rise to much legal verbiage; Ovid speaks of 'uadimonia garrula' (*Amor.* i 12, 23).

procedure  
'in iure'.

464. When the two parties were before the praetor, the plaintiff described the form of remedy to which he thought himself entitled ('edere formulam' or 'actionem'). Most of the 'formulae', or types of direction which might be issued to the inferior court, were exhibited in the forum on a white board ('album'). In many cases there would be no contention as to the form which the direction was to take. But there might be much wrangling before the matter was decided. The wrangling might terminate in the case being dismissed by the praetor on some point of form. A litigant who lost his case for some formal error, and not on the substance

of his claim, was said 'causa cadere', or 'formula cadere', and this might happen either in the superior or in the inferior court. To avoid this, in any difficult case, the litigant would seek the advice of a 'iuris consultus', who would be disgraced if his counsel led to disaster (Cic. *Mur.* 9).

These 'iuris consulti' or 'iuris prudentes' play a great part in Roman legal history. They were usually men of high standing, often men who had been conspicuous in political life (§ 411). The opinions given by them had great influence in the re-shaping of the law. The century from Hadrian to Seuerus Alexander was the most flourishing period of the juriconsults. Two great schools existed, the 'Proculiani', eager to reform law, and the 'Sabiniani', who adhered more to tradition. Hadrian appointed a limited number of juriconsults, whose 'responsa' were binding on the courts.

465. To understand the wrangling which might go on before the praetor, it is necessary to grasp the structure of the 'formula', 'formula'. The 'formula' proper followed on a statement of the authority appointed to try the facts. It took the form of an order addressed to that authority. In the general type of order which appeared in the 'album' the litigant was denoted as Aulus Agerius, and Numerius Negidius, names somewhat like the English 'John Doe' and 'Richard Roe' (though these names, unlike the Roman, intruded themselves into actual litigation). The formula began with a short statement of case called 'demonstratio', such as 'quod Aulus Agerius Numerio Negidio hominem uendidit, qua de re agitur'. Next came the 'intentio', usually beginning with 'si paret', and followed by the facts, as stated by the plaintiff. Then followed the 'condemnatio', in the form 'condemnato', succeeded by 'si non paret, absolutio'. The inferior court was always authorised to condemn the defendant to a recompense in money. According to the nature of the case, the sum might be fixed, or left to the discretion of the court, with or without a maximum limit.

466. Such was the skeleton framework of the formula. But it might become much more complicated. Sometimes a statement praescriptio. was prefixed called 'praescriptio' (to which Cicero alludes in *Fin.* ii 3). This was inserted to limit the judge, and it might take many forms. The inferior court might be restricted in the extent to which the defendant should be made to suffer, or might be debarred from condemning in certain circumstances.

Other clauses meant for the protection of the defendant could be inserted in the 'intentio'. These were 'exceptiones', whereby the court was ordered to condemn the defendant *if* certain facts were proved, *unless* certain others were proved. The 'unless' clause is the exceptio. 'exceptio', which existed in a multiplicity of forms. One of the commonest was the 'exceptio rei iudicatae', referring to a claim that the matter had been previously decided (cp. 'quod ea res in iudicium antea uenisset', Cic. *De Or.* i c. 37). Another ordinary 'exceptio' was the 'exceptio metus' which alleged that the agreement on which the action was based had been obtained by intimidation. Also the 'exceptio doli mali', concern-

ing fraud. A celebrated definition of what constituted 'dolus malus' was given by Aquilius Gallus, the colleague of Cicero in his praetorship: 'cum esset aliud simulatum, aliud actum' (Cic. *Off.* iii 60). He also instituted a separate form of action about 'dolus malus', which Cicero describes as having made a clean sweep of all kinds of chicanery ('euerriculum malitiarum omnium', *N. D.* iii 74). It was possible to graft a second exception on the first ('duplicatio'), and a third on the second, and so on. Some of these refinements naturally were in the interest of the plaintiff.

467. Some point might be raised before the praetor which required a preliminary trial before the original one could proceed. This was 'praeiudicium'. The most important cases of the kind were those in which a question of status was started, concerning freedom, citizenship, or free birth. In the formulae relating to these trials there was no 'condemnatio'.

468. The proceedings 'in iure' ended with the 'litis contestatio', by which the course of the case and the points to be decided were embodied in a document and attested by both parties. It formed the basis for the litigation 'in iudicio' and was, in a sense, an agreement to abide by the issue, and in fact it constituted a sort of obligation for the parties.

469. The civil suit was not often carried as far as the 'condemnatio'. It was to the interest of the defendant, if the case were going against him, to agree with his adversary out of court; and in that case there would be an understanding that the court was to dismiss the case. If the 'condemnatio' took place, and the defendant did not comply with the judgment, an 'actio iudicati' could be brought against him before the praetor. In the case of a 'legitimum iudicium', the regular process for debt availed. Where the original suit depended on the praetor's edict, bankruptcy proceedings at once ensued. The praetor gave the judgment creditor the 'missio in bona' and the other creditors were called in to take part. First came 'proscriptio bonorum', or notice that the sale of the whole of the debtor's estate would take place. The creditors appointed a 'magister' or 'magistri' to conduct the sale, and the property was by auction made over to the buyer who offered to pay the highest fraction of the debts to the creditors. (One of the bitterest of Cicero's jests is recorded by Quintil. vi 3; speaking of a woman of evil character, who corrupted many, he said 'eam, dum uixit, ludum, post mortem magistros habuisse'—she was head of a school while she lived, but under masters herself after she died bankrupt.) In the case of a hopeless insolvency the property would sometimes be sold for a nominal sum 'nummo sestertio'. Cf. Cic. *Rab. Post.* 45 'ecquis est ex tanto populo qui bona C. Rabiri Postumi nummo sestertio sibi addici uelit?'

470. It may be convenient to mention here other actions which led to bankruptcy besides the non-compliance with a judgment on a suit.

Cicero's speech 'pro Quintio' is concerned with a case of 'missio in possessionem' and (*ib.* 60) four grounds for granting it are mentioned, 'qui fraudationis causa latitarit', 'cui heres non exabit', 'qui exilii causa solum uerterit', 'qui absens iudicio defensus non fuerit'. To avoid risks, it was customary for an absent citizen to have a 'procurator' who could sue or be sued for him. (A 'cognitor' is a representative appointed with consent of the praetor for a particular case.) The man 'cuius bona possessa sunt' laboured under disgrace and, to a certain extent, incapacity. The bankrupt was not allowed to come into court to make a claim, unless he could give security that any damages he might incur would be paid ('satisfactio iudicatum solui'). Quintius, in the case mentioned, declared that the 'missio in possessionem' had been secured by a trick, and Cicero loudly protested against his client being subjected to the consequences.

471. In some kinds of litigation, the unsuccessful litigant would lose not merely the value of the thing in dispute, but something more, by way of penalty. This took place in the 'iudicium certae pecuniae', where rigorous rules prevailed. Each litigant had to bind himself by the 'sponsio' to pay, in case of failure, one third of the amount in dispute. This 'sponsio' was in fact a wager; each staked a certain sum on the correctness of his claim. Cicero's speech 'pro Roscio Comoedo' was delivered in a suit for 'certa pecunia', and he speaks of this 'tertia pars' (§ 14), or 'legitimae partis sponsio' (§ 9). All 'sponsiones' of this class were termed 'poenales', as opposed to 'praeiudiciales', such wagers as merely served to introduce an action, where the stake was nominal. This latter form of 'sponsio' was often a mere bet, though it was decided by legal process. Almost any matter could be brought before a court in this way. When the subject of a 'sponsio' is mentioned, it is ordinarily introduced by 'ni', because the challenger offers to pay money, 'unless' something which he asserts is proved true. On one occasion a wager was made to the effect that a certain Roman knight was 'not a good man' ('ni uir bonus esset'). The case got as far as a 'iudex', but he declined to adjudicate on such a question (Cic. *Off.* iii 77). An agent of Verres was challenged in this way to say whether Verres was not his secret partner in the farming of tithes (*Verr.* ii 3, 137). If a plaintiff was victorious, he was said 'sponsione uincere' (*Caec.* § 91, if defeated 'sponsione uinci' (*pro Quint.* § 84). In the everyday wager (on a horse-race for example) the same language was employed. In many cases the 'sponsio', the successor of the 'sacramentum', must have been an inconvenient formality, and it could often be avoided by a formula known as 'formula petitoria', which existed from Cicero's time. But the older procedure 'per sponsionem' remained as an alternative.

472. In certain cases, the condemnatio in itself carried with it a money penalty over and above the damages, as in the 'actio infamia, iudicati', where twice the amount originally in dispute



had to be paid ('lis infitiando crescit in duplum'). In other cases, the danger affected reputation, the penalty being 'infamia', the punishment of 'fides mala'. Such condemnations, though not technically criminal, approached the criminal character in their practical results. Hence they are sometimes classed along with the decisions of the criminal courts, as by Cic. *Nat. D.* iii 74. Four kinds of cases are often mentioned, those arising from 'tutela, mandatum, societas, fiducia' (Cic. *l. l.* and *Off.* iii 70). Others were the 'actio furti', and the 'actio legis Plaetoriae'. This law punished the cheating of young men ('circumscriptio adulescentium'), when minority was prolonged to 25 years of age, by a criminal prosecution ('iudicium publicum rei priuatae', Cic.) or a civil action involving 'infamia'. This is the law to which Plautus makes allusion in *Pseud.* i 3, 69 and *Rud.* v 3, 25 by the curious name of 'lex quinauicenaria'. Classes of persons liable to 'infamia', whether in consequence of a condemnation, criminal or civil, or from other causes, appeared in the praetor's edict. The 'infamia' or 'ignominia' (the two terms cannot be distinguished) entailed incapacity for public station, such as magistracies, Roman or municipal, and also certain dishonouring disabilities in case of future litigation. Another kind of penalty might be incurred by misuse of the forms of law, for which offence 'calumnia' was the name. The term of course does not correspond with our 'calumny', but resembles in sense the Greek *συκοφαντία*. It has a wide application in criminal as well as in civil cases. In a civil suit each litigant might tender to the other the 'ius iurandum calumniae', to the effect that he believed in his contentions, and that the process of the court was not being abused. If the defendant could prove such abuse against the plaintiff, he could sue for damages to a specified amount by the 'iudicium calumniae'. Some kinds of trickery on the part of litigants, bribery for instance, could be punished criminally.

473. Not only the litigants, but the subordinate judge who mis-conducted a case, might suffer for it. He was sometimes said 'litem suam facere' by his wrong dealing; that is, one who was a loser by it would have a remedy against him. (For a curious metaphorical application of 'litem suam facere' see Cic. *De Or.* ii 305.) It is said that the acceptance of a bribe by a 'iudex' or 'arbiter' led to a death sentence according to the Twelve Tables; and it continued to be a criminal offence.

Punishment of  
subordinate,

474. Misconduct on the part of the praetor was punishable like any other official malpractice, by criminal procedure. At one time a supreme judge, who had given an unjust decree, could be compelled to submit to similar injustice, if he himself became a litigant (Cic. *Q. Fr.* i 1, 21). There was apparently some difficulty, even at the end of the Republican age, in making praetors hold to the terms of their edict; for in 67 a law was passed by the tribune Cornelius 'ut praetores ex edictis suis perpetuis ius dicerent' (Ascon. in Cic. *Corn.* p. 58).

or supreme  
judge.

475. Some forms of law, from their peculiarities, need special explanation. The chief of these is the process by 'interdictum'.  
interdictum.

The essential feature of the interdict is that it is a peremptory order addressed by the chief judge to a person, requiring him to do or refrain from doing some act. Orders bearing this name were issued freely by magistrates for the protection of public property of all sorts, and, in such cases, they amount to regulations of police. But the 'interdictum' was often introductory to litigation. The developments in this department of law were very numerous and complicated; but we can here deal only with a few: such particularly as are most likely to be met with by the classical student.

The application of the 'interdictum' to disputes about land is the subject of two Ciceronian speeches, the 'pro Tullio' and the 'pro Caecina'. In such cases the dispute was about 'possessio', not about ownership. If the dispute were a peaceable one, the two litigants would agree which of them was to figure as plaintiff, which as defendant. The plaintiff would make an attempt to set foot on the land; this was formally repelled by the defendant, whose action is 'deductio quae moribus fit' (Cic. *Caec.* in several passages). But, by a peculiar use of 'uis', the claimant, in making his claim, was said 'uim facere', and this kind of 'uis' was called by later lawyers 'uis ciuilis' or 'uis quotidiana'. This 'deiectus' then applied to the praetor for an order to be served on his opponent to 'replace him in possession' ('restituere in possessionem'). But, in the case supposed, the order was accompanied by three modifications ('exceptiones'). If the defendant could prove that the original 'possessio' was acquired 'ui aut clam aut precario' (by violence, or clandestine occupation, or by a tenancy revocable at will), he was not bound to obey the command. If the defendant contested the justice of the order, he was allowed to put in a fictitious plea that he had made restitution. On this a 'sponsio' was framed, and a iudex or recuperatores tried out the facts, and the decision was given on the merits of the case. When a case came before recuperatores the number of witnesses was limited to ten (Cic. *Caec.* 26). If the violence was real ('uis armata' or 'uis armatis hominibus'), the praetor omitted, as a rule, all exceptions (Cic. *Caec.* 23). In his speech for Caecina Cicero argues that, if force had been used, the question of possessio was totally disregarded by the law, and the subordinate judges could not take it into account. But it cannot be believed that a holder of land who repelled by force a mere marauder, would be ordered to place the marauder in possession. The contention is contradicted by a passage of the 'pro Tullio' (45). And in some cases an exception could be inserted for the benefit of the defendant 'quod prior hominibus armatis non uenerit'. There is a jocular application of this exception in a letter of Cicero to Trebatius (*Fam.* vii 13).

476. The procedure by interdict filled many gaps in the scheme of Roman law. It was suitable for the protection of tenancies in the 'publicus

ager', in which there could be only 'possessio', not 'dominium'. There is a reference to this practice in the *lex agraria* of 111 B.C. (*C. I. L.* i 200). Interdicts were classified in different ways. There were 'interdicta adipiscendae possessionis' and 'retinendae possessionis'. Some were classed as 'restitutoria', others as 'prohibitoria', others as 'exhibitoria'. The last enabled persons or property, wrongfully concealed, to be produced for the jurisdiction of the courts. An interesting example is the 'interdictum de libero homine exhibendo', a sort of writ of 'habeas corpus', which might be moved for by any citizen in favour of a free man alleged to be wrongfully held in durance.

Classes of  
interdicta.

477. The procedure 'per formulam', which involved two handlings of a case, one 'in iure', the other 'in iudicio', stands in contrast with the 'cognitio' of the magistrate, when he gives a decision on the merits of facts brought before him, and the litigation is only 'in iure'. When the formulary process was established, such action by the magistrate was regarded as being 'extra ordinem', outside the usual round; but much of it was of everyday occurrence. The interdict cases are sometimes placed under this head, but inconveniently, as the majority of them led to litigation of the ordinary type. But all non-contentious litigation, such as 'in iure cessio' (§ 427), was 'extra ordinem', in the sense given above; also matters connected with 'tutela' and 'curatela' (§ 421 f); and many kinds of 'missio in possessionem' (§ 470) with cases of 'fideicommissa' (§ 439). An interesting example of the procedure 'extra ordinem' is the 'restitutio in integrum', whereby a case already decided by a secondary court was put back for review before the praetor on grounds of miscarriage of justice, by reason, for instance, of illegal compulsion by violence or menace ('uis' or 'metus'), or treachery ('dolus'), or merely error.

Procedure  
'extra  
ordinem'.

478. There were a number of distinctions between forms of procedure, which are almost confined to technical legal literature, and only a few need brief mention here. The terms 'actio' and 'iudicium' were never clearly distinguishable; in later writers, the latter prevails. A difference, which is important but difficult to trace in detail, lies between 'actio in rem' and 'actio in personam'. In the early procedure, the litigants were brought definitely into contact with a 'res', if the latter were involved in the dispute. The claimant had to touch it with a 'fessuca' or 'uindicta', and this was 'uindicatio'. The phrases 'in rem' and 'uindicatio' continued to be used under the formulary system. Generally speaking, 'actiones in personam' were such as arose from obligations of any kind. The contrast between 'actiones certae pecuniae' and 'incertae', between 'actiones bonae fidei' and 'stricti iuris', will be understood from what has been said above (§§ 461, 472). The difference between cases in which the subordinate court could estimate damages ('litis aestimatio'),

actio and  
iudicium.

Distinctions  
between  
classes of  
actions.

and those in which it could only award a precise sum or nothing, was of course fundamental. In the former department there might be a superior limit, or none ('*quanti ea res erit*'). The '*actio ciuilis*', as opposed to '*honoraria*', is that which is presumed to derive from law, in contradistinction to one springing from the praetor's edict. The '*actio poenalis*' involves for the defendant loss over and above damages; the loss may be in fame or pocket (§ 472). An '*actio annalis*' is one which must be brought within a year. In the earlier law, action was not barred by time, except in such cases as were covered by '*usucapio*'; but the praetor introduced the year's limit for much litigation. The phrase '*iudicia quae imperio continentur*' (Gaius iv 103) implies that cases which are not '*legitima*' must be finished within the term of office of the magistrate who started the action. Hence there was a rush to the courts, when new magistrates entered on office, and to this Juvenal alludes (xvi 42): '*expectandus erit qui lites incohet annus*'. A lex Iulia iudiciaria required legitima iudicia to be concluded within a year and a half from the '*litis contestatio*'. The only other phrase that need be noted here is '*actio in factum concepta*'. Here the '*formula*' strictly confined the secondary court to facts: whereas the other '*formulae*' might enable it to consider to some extent the relation of the facts to law; as in the case where the court was directed to determine what a man *ought* to give or do ('*dare facere oportere*'). The '*actio in factum concepta*' depended frankly on the imperium of the judge and not on the '*ius ciuile*', or its professed interpretations.

479. The change which the Empire introduced into the character and administration of the civil law was profound. One general tendency is very conspicuous, to obliterate the distinction between the primary and the secondary court, between '*ius*' and '*iudicium*'. The formulary procedure was undermined, and, by the time that the new monarchy of Diocletian was established, few traces of it remained, and these soon vanished. The exceptional procedure '*extra ordinem*' became regular, and the same authority saw a case through, from start to finish. Hence, in Justinian's Institutes (iv 15, 8) and elsewhere, it is laid down that all '*iudicia*' had become '*extraordinaria*'. The simplicity of the praetor's court rapidly disappeared, and a multiplicity of officers took charge of legal executive duties, which followed the general alterations in the magistracies. In Italy, special judges ('*consulares*' under Hadrian or '*iuridici*' under M. Aurelius) greatly restricted the area of the praetor's activity. And, even in the capital itself, much business was withdrawn from him. The legal duties of the consuls were increased (§ 385) partly by direct transfer of particular matters to them, partly by the Senate becoming a court of appeal in civil cases arising within Italy. The interference of the emperor himself in the supervision of the law became more frequent, as the importance of the Senate declined, and, by the third century, the most important legal officers were his representatives. It was a serious step

Changes under  
the Empire.



when Claudius delegated to his 'procuratores' the right to decide cases in which the 'fiscus' was concerned. When Nerva and Trajan reversed this rule, Pliny lauded them saying, 'eodem foro utuntur principatus et libertas' (*Paneg.* 36). But, in this field, as in all others, the emperor's will became dominant. The greatest legal functionary of the later despotic Empire was the 'quaestor sacri palatii'. When Rome became merely a municipality, not a seat of government, its chief legal authority was the 'praefectus urbi' (§ 397).

480. We have still to survey the history of legal administration, on its criminal side, so far as it has not been already noticed in connexion with the development of the political constitution. The main features of the Republican system have been already sketched: the authority of the comitia and their dependence on the 'prouocatio' (§§ 316, 325, 376, 378); the general course of proceedings in a trial before an assembly (§ 378); the difference herein between the centuriate and the tribal assemblies (§ 376); the supersession in practice of the comitia by the 'quaestiones' (§§ 338, 349); the prominence of the tribunes as prosecutors in political cases (§ 367); the presidency of praetors and ex-aediles over the 'quaestiones' (§§ 363, 365); and the composition of the criminal juries (§§ 342, 346, 349). We have also glanced at the transition from the Republican to the imperial system (§§ 388, 398). We must now add a few particulars with regard to the Republic, and finally trace in outline the evolution of criminal administration under the Empire.

Criminal  
law.

481. The inconveniences of the method of trial by the assembly were so great that its continued existence for most offences down to the age of Sulla is remarkable. Plautus speaks of attendance on trials as though it were just as constant an occupation of the citizen at Rome as at Athens (*Capt.* iii 1, 15).

Comitial and  
other forms of  
trial.

But a large number of minor offences were of course not handled by the comitial courts. Many were treated by magistrates directly as matters of police, and the control over non-citizens was, in general, unlimited. And even citizens of the lowest class must have been summarily dealt with by the police authorities, especially the 'tresuiri capitales'. Technically, the 'prouocatio' was allowed to every citizen, but its value in practice depended to some extent on the willingness of the magistrates, particularly the tribunes, to concede it; and it would be impossible for the everyday marauder and the red-handed murderer to make good his claim. The activity of the comitia in criminal matters was also restricted by the jurisdiction of the 'paterfamilias' (§ 405); by the privileges of the military authorities (§ 376); and by the technical treatment of some acts, theft for example, as civil wrongs. Moreover, not a few civil actions led to consequences which affected the person, as well as the property of the unsuccessful litigant, and may therefore be regarded as 'quasi-criminal' (§ 472). The criminal jurisdiction, which was exercised outside Rome, in Roman

and non-Roman communities, by municipal officers or Roman provincial governors, cannot be considered in any detail, though it will be necessary to give a glance at the subject here and there.

482. One leading difference between the comitial trial and the trial by quaestio was that the former was subject from start to finish to the rules of *intercessio* (though these were not usually employed to bar criminal proceedings), while the quaestio was exempt from this control. This freedom was probably given by legislation. And any cause whatever which might cut short a formal meeting of the *comitia* held for a judicial purpose would put an end to the prosecution. The more serious offences came before the centuries, the less serious, particularly those punished by fine, before the tribes.

483. The one penalty which the centuries could pronounce was that of death, and in the earliest days it must often have been inflicted. But in the later centuries of the Republic, the culprit condemned by the centuries, and he also who had been pronounced guilty in a quaestio of a capital offence, was permitted to withdraw into an exile which was technically voluntary. This *‘ἐκούσιος φυγάδεια’* surprised Polybius (vi 14). Writing in 66 B.C. Cicero said correctly: *‘exilium non supplicium est sed per fugium portusque supplicii’* (*Caec.* § 100). But he himself was destined to break through this ancient rule. As consul, he passed a law to check bribery, which for the first time definitely allowed a court to pronounce sentence of exile. The regular course was that a plea should be put in on the criminal's behalf that he had gone into exile (§ 378), whereupon he was subjected to the *‘interdictio aqua et igni’*, as it was commonly called; but, in the actual resolution, *‘tecto’* was added. The criminal was thus deprived of the necessities of life within the *‘Romanus ager’*. Many states entered into reciprocal obligations with Rome to harbour exiles. In early days the condemned criminal could find a pleasant refuge at Tibur or some other city close by; but after the Social War he had to leave Italy. By becoming a citizen of another town he ceased to be a Roman, for it was a fundamental principle of the Roman polity that no one could be a citizen of two cities at one and the same time (*Cic. Balb.* § 28 and *Caec.* § 100). And the sentence which led to exile could only be reversed by a comitial enactment, which reinstated the man as a Roman citizen. This was a rare occurrence until the age of the civil wars, when it became common.

484. The death-penalty for the citizen was therefore practically abolished in the Republican period. Such executions as did occur were exceptional, and due, not so much to law, as to a suspension of law, such as that involved in the *‘senatus consultum ultimum’* (§ 345), or the senatorial criminal commissions (§ 340), or the proscriptions of Sulla and the Triumvirs. The

Comitial trial,  
and trial by  
quaestio.

Penalty of  
death.

Sentence of  
exile.

Death-penalty  
rare under the  
Republic.

law of Sulla which regulated the court for trying murder allowed the execution of a parricide. But even this provision was repealed by Pompeius. The growing frequency of executions and other personal punishments is a marked characteristic of the Empire as contrasted with the Republic.

485. A judicial meeting of the centuries was presided over by a praetor, of the tribes by a tribune, if he were prosecutor and the tribunal was a 'concilium plebis'; in other cases by a magistrate with imperium, who summoned the comitia tributa (when there was an appeal from a fine imposed by an aedile or a pontifex maximus).

Trial before the assemblies.

All through the Republican period, and indeed even later, the prosecutor came forward voluntarily, invited in many instances by rewards of different kinds specified in statutes. The persons who were disqualified to act as prosecutors were in the main those who, for one cause or another, were incapacitated for public functions in general; but some other restrictions were added; as for instance, on the arraignment of a father by a son, of a 'patronus' by a freedman, and so on. In a few instances, persons ordinarily incapacitated might prosecute; aliens for example on a charge of 'repetundae'. There is a peculiar provision in the lex Acilia repetundarum of 122 B.C. (c. 78), which grants to a Latin who has successfully charged a culprit, under the statute, the choice between becoming a Roman citizen, and acquiring the 'prouocatio', while remaining a Latin. In the later days of the Republic, a man of rank would be condemned by public opinion for acting as prosecutor, unless he were a young orator with his name to make, or had private wrongs to avenge (Cic. *Off.* ii 50, iii 90). The first step was to approach a magistrate, competent to take the charge. In the case of a quaestio he was called 'quaesitor' (§ 363). The prosecutor was said 'deferre nomen', the magistrate 'accipere nomen', if he was satisfied that there was a case for investigation. There was always one recognised responsible prosecutor ('accusator'), who however might have backers ('subscriptores') who assisted in getting up the case, or gave him countenance. If more than one person wished to prosecute on the same charge, a preliminary inquiry was held to select one of them. This process was called 'diuinatio', a term which seems to have survived from an earlier procedure, in which selection was made by lot. The same 'quaesitor' and the same jury who were to try the culprit determined who should be the 'accusator'. The process is best known to us from Cicero's speech 'in Q. Caecilium'. In every case, whether it came before the comitia or the quaestio, the accused was permitted to be at large, on giving security ('uadimonia') for his appearance at the proper times.

Preliminaries to a trial.

486. The magistrate in charge named the day of hearing; this is 'diem dicere', a phrase often applied to prosecutors, who, unless they were tribunes, would not really be able to fix the

Details of procedure.

time. The four hearings in the comitial trial have been mentioned above (§ 378). The rules as to adjournment in the *quaestiones* varied a good deal. The earlier '*leges repetundarum*' allowed a case to be decided on the first hearing, or to be repeatedly adjourned ('*ampliatio*'). But the *lex Seruilia* of 111 B.C. required at least two hearings, the second being two days after the first (Cic. *Verr. Act* ii 1 § 26). This was called '*comperendinatio*'. Under the exceptional laws passed by Pompeius in his third consulship (52) only one hearing was allowed. Custom required that, during the period of the trial, the accused should appear in a state of 'squalor'; that is, with unshorn hair and beard, and with mourning apparel. The culprit could have a '*patronus*' to speak for him, or indeed several '*patroni*'; the prosecutor was not allowed the assistance of counsel, except in cases of '*repetundae*', and when women or children were the nominal prosecutors. To the '*subscriptores*' on the side of the prosecutor the '*aduocati*' on that of the culprit partly corresponded; they sometimes assisted in the management of the case, but often were men of note, merely brought in to give moral support by their presence. In the imperial age '*aduocatus*' comes to be equivalent in meaning to '*patronus*'. Misconduct connected with prosecutions was punishable criminally, as '*calumnia*', the bringing of a charge known by the prosecutor to be false; '*praeuāricatio*', collusion of the prosecutor with the '*reus*'; and '*tergiuersatio*', improper abandonment of a prosecution. Every bringing of a charge is technically '*delatio*', and every prosecutor is '*delator*', but the '*delator*', of whose punishment we often hear in the early Empire, was generally one who traded on law for the rewards offered by the statutes for successful prosecutions; and these were often gained in cases not strictly criminal in their character.

487. The process of getting together a jury was directed by the president of the court, guided by rules laid down in statutes; and these varied from time to time. Till 123 B.C. juries were drawn from the Senate only, from 123 to 81 from the equites only, from 81 to 70 from the Senate again; from 70 to 46 from senators, equites, and *tribuni aerarii* in equal proportions. How the '*tribuni aerarii*' were defined is not known; in social position they were near the equites and may have had a property qualification only a little lower. Julius Caesar removed them. Augustus directed that juries should be drawn from senators and equites; some came from great distances to Rome and were '*indocti saepius atque interim rustici*' (Quint. iv 2, 45). An age limit was laid down; except under the *lex Aurelia*, it was 30 years. Every year the '*praetor urbanus*' and later the emperor put forward a general list ('*album*') of men selected to serve ('*selecti iudices*'), arranged in sections called '*decuriae*'. Out of this a particular list was drawn for each *quaestio*, and from this again a special list for each case. The last stage was subject to varying conditions imposed from time to time by statute. A limited right of rejection was always allowed to the '*reus*' and generally

Composition  
of the jury.



to the 'accusator'. The *lex Tullia de ambitu* of 63 B.C. and the *lex Licinia de sodaliciis* of 55 (by which the case of Cicero's client Plancius was governed) prescribed 'editicii iudices', who were selected, according to certain directions, by the prosecutor, a limited right of rejection being granted to the 'reus'. The members of the juries ('consilia') varied a good deal in number; 51 and 75 were not uncommon figures.

488. The rules of evidence were somewhat complicated. Powers of compelling witnesses to appear were more limited than in modern courts, and the accused was herein at a disadvantage with the prosecutor. Certain classes of persons, especially all who laboured under 'infamia', were incapable of giving evidence ('intestabiles'). During the Republican period, examination by torture could only be applied to slaves. In giving his evidence, the witness used the word 'arbitrari' (which here carried a reminiscence of the original sense of 'arbitrator', viz. a bystander); and the jury in giving their opinion employed 'uideri', before the age of the ballot (Cic.

Rules of  
evidence.

Verdict.

*Acad.* ii 146). Secret voting was introduced into the comitia for all purposes in the latter part of the second century B.C., and was transferred to the quaestiones. Each juror was supplied with a wax ticket ('tabella') marked on one side with A ('absoluo') and on the other with C ('condemno'). He scratched out one or other of these letters and placed the tabella in an urn, which is 'sitella' in the *lex Acilia*, but more usually 'urna'. Sometimes the accused could demand an open vote (Cic. *Clu.* 55, 75). A bare majority sufficed for the decision. If it was not reached before the magistrate in charge went out of office, the case fell through. Hence there was sometimes a good deal of manœuvring. Under the law of Gracchus and the *lex Aurelia* the equites were not responsible for malpractice as jurymen; but, apart from that, responsibility rested on all jurors. Important 'leges Iuliae iudiciariae' were passed by Augustus, which long continued to regulate matters connected with 'iudices'.

489. Before the complete establishment of the quaestiones temporary criminal courts for special purposes were sometimes set up by enactment, as by the *lex Mamilia* of 110 B.C., to punish those who had trafficked with Jugurtha, and by the *lex Varia* of 91 B.C. to try those who had encouraged the allies to revolt. Even after Sulla, exceptional courts were established from time to time, sometimes, as in Pompey's third consulship, to administer laws of increased severity, in the hope of checking disorder. Clodius was tried by a special court, established by a law, for his profanation of the rites of the Bona Dea.

Temporary  
criminal  
courts.

490. When Caesar shattered the Republic, the inadequacy of the criminal administration had been fully demonstrated. With the reign of Augustus a new era began. The quaestiones were not abolished, but their importance was gradually undermined, until in the third century they vanished. Im-

The quaes-  
tiones super-  
seded.

portant cases tended to come before the Senate or the emperor. But all criminal justice, like every other department of public business, ultimately fell under the personal direction of the emperor, as the Senate itself sank into unimportance. By the third century, criminal judges, trying cases not with juries, but with legal advisers ('consilium'), were imperial nominees. The 'praefectus praetorio', for example, obtained an extended criminal jurisdiction. The authority of the 'praefectus urbi' grew at the expense of the quaestiones. Early in the third century the criminal law in Italy had fallen into the hands of the 'praefectus urbi' and the 'praefectus praetorio' (§ 398); while in the provinces, all governors had received the 'ius gladii' from the emperor, which subjected even the Roman citizens to their tribunals, with few restrictions.

491. We have many pictures of trials before the Senate, during the first century A.D., in the pages of Tacitus and Pliny. The manner in which the emperor's intervention was brought about is illustrated by Pliny (*Ep.* vi 31), where he describes three days spent by Trajan upon criminal trials in his villa at Centumcellae. One culprit was a freedman of his own, charged with forging a will; and the true heirs had induced the emperor to sit in judgment. On giving sentence in another case, Trajan placed on record his reasons for judging it: 'ne omnis eius modi causas ad se reuocare uideretur'. Charges in which important imperial servants were concerned ordinarily came before the emperor. If he allowed one to go before the Senate, he was deemed to be acting 'ciuilitur'; but this very rarely happened, when the offences were military. In other cases the ruler was often glad to leave to the Senate the odium of condemnations; and the Senate could not well refuse. In the 'Agricola' (c. 45), Tacitus recalls in pathetic words the share which he had as senator in the judicial murder of Heluidius Priscus: 'nostrae manus Heluidium in carcerem duxerunt'. As the emperor's interference in criminal matters increased in frequency, he would often nominate a delegate to try a case (*Plin. Ep.* vii 6); later, regular judges with imperial commission tried all cases. In the monarchy of Diocletian and Constantine these duties were elaborately regulated and divided out among the members of the vast bureaucracy. In the early Empire the Senate strove hard to retain jurisdiction in criminal matters over its own members, but in the third century the cherished right vanished altogether (§ 398), though even after that time peccant senators were not treated altogether as other offenders were. Until Constantine's time every senator had a right to be tried in the capital.

492. In the first century, the 'ius gladii' accorded to provincial governors (§ 398) was often imperfect. St Paul's claim to 'appeal to Caesar' from the procurator of Judaea was immediately allowed; and Pliny in Bithynia ruled that Christians who were Roman citizens should be sent to Rome for trial (*Ep. ad Trai.*

Trials before  
the emperor

or the Senate.

Trials of  
senators.

The right  
of appeal.

96). At first, probably, appeal was granted in every such case to a Roman court or to the princeps. The appeal to the emperor was the most far-reaching of all changes introduced by the Empire into the Republican system. We have seen that a sentence of a Republican court was not alterable except by legislation. But the imperial 'tribunicia potestas' gave the ruler power over every sentence of a court unless he renounced it, as in the case of the 'præfecti prætorio'. In the early Empire, the power was not usually exercised against a verdict given in the Senate. And, even if the emperor did not interfere with a sentence on the ground of its injustice, he might release the culprit from its consequences. This right of pardoning was at first shared with the Senate.

493. One great characteristic of the criminal administration of the Empire was the variety of the punishments which it imposed.

The penalty of death was carried out against the Roman citizen with continually increasing frequency, and was extended to crimes of comparatively small importance. Nor could it be escaped, as in Republican times, by voluntary exile. Forms of execution, some of which had been unpractised for centuries, and even some which had been previously confined to slaves, were now applied to citizens. The old punishment described as 'more maiorum', that is execution by the axe after flogging, which was symbolised by the magisterial 'fasces' and 'secures', was revived in the early Empire (Tac. *An.* ii 32; Suet. *Nero* 49). Also the old style of execution for the parricide, who was sewn up in a sack with a cock, ape, and serpent, and drowned (Suet. *Claud.* 34). Crucifixion also was inflicted on citizens, until Constantine put an end to it on religious grounds. Death by fire is said to have been laid down for arson in the Twelve Tables; in Caesar's day it was sometimes used as a military punishment. In the imperial time it was a penalty for many offences. Beheading by the sword was also common ('decollatio'). And of very frequent occurrence (most familiar to us through the Christian martyrdoms) was the death in the arena, either by wild beasts or by fighting in the gladiatorial exhibitions.

Penalties  
under the  
Empire.

494. Penal servitude was an invention of the Empire. A man might become 'seruus poenæ' generally, the emperor using him as he pleased; or might be specially condemned to serve in the mines, which were property of the State ('damnatio ad metalla'); or to perform any degrading public task. When freedom was not lost, political rights might be taken away. Exile in several forms became an ordinary punishment. Besides the old 'exilium', which continued, there was 'deportatio', especially to some desolate island, with loss of citizenship. Juvenal's description of the Aegean islets as crammed with exiles will be remembered (xiii 246). From 'deportatio' must be carefully distinguished 'relégatio', which was at the outset merely removal to a distance from Rome, often with enforced domicile, but without other infringements of liberty. Ovid,

Penal  
servitude.

deportatio.  
relégatio.

in his poems written at Tomi, is careful to insist on the difference: 'edictum...in poenae nomine lene fuit; | quippe relegatus, non exul dicor in illo' (*Trist.* ii 137). But later on 'relegatio' might be accompanied by punishments affecting status, but falling short of 'deportatio'. In the Republican age 'relegatio' was only applied to foreigners, whom the magistrates often expelled from the city. The consuls of 58 B.C. drove out in this way a knight who had shown sympathy with Cicero; but it was an illegal act. This form of banishment was not usually preceded by a trial. Imprisonment *per se* was not employed as an ordinary punishment, either under the Republic, or under the Empire. In the course of criminal proceedings, the free witness might in the imperial time be examined by torture, formerly restricted to slaves.

495. In the earlier age, the citizen had been protected against scourging ('uerbera') by the *leges Porciae*, to which there are many references in literature. But, in the later time, it was a common penalty for minor crimes, and was sometimes an accompaniment of the larger penalties. Short of loss of liberty or citizenship, several infringements of status, such as 'infamia', were awarded for crime, but none of these were peculiar to the Empire. Nor do the penalties affecting property call for much comment. The combination of pecuniary with personal penalties was much commoner in the imperial age than earlier. Confiscation of a man's entire property accompanied condemnation for 'maiestas', and partial confiscation occurred in many other circumstances (Suet. *Caes.* 42), particularly when 'deportatio' was inflicted; and ultimately this might be combined with 'relegatio'.

496. Another marked feature of punishment in the later Empire was that it depended to some extent on station. Men were classed as 'honestiores' on the one hand, and 'plebei' or 'tenuiores' or 'humiliores' on the other. The former class included members of the 'ordo senatorius' (in the extended sense given to the phrase), the equestrian body, and the members of the municipal councils ('decuriones') and to some extent veteran soldiers. The higher class and the lower were often punished differently for the same crime. As a rule, the 'honestiores' were free from aggravations of the death penalty, such as crucifixion and exposition in the arena; also from scourging, examination by torture, condemnation to work in the mines, and penal servitude in general. But all 'honestiores' were not on the same level of privilege. Until Constantine's time, Senators could only be judged at Rome (§ 488). Other 'honestiores' could be condemned in the provinces, but their punishment could not be carried out until confirmed by the emperor. In legal matters, as in all others, the tendency of the Empire was towards inequality.

497. In the earliest days, a crime committed by a slave was judged and punished entirely by his master, who could commit no crime against him. But, as in the case of the children 'in

Other  
penalties.'

Status of per-  
sons punished.

Punishment  
of slaves.



patria potestate' and the wife 'in manu', the 'iudicium domesticum' was gradually restricted by the State in the case of the slave. He could be arraigned by the courts and either be punished by public authority (the scale of punishment being defined by law) or handed over to his owner for punishment. And he came to be protected by law against wrongs done to him by his master. The 'praefectus urbi' was the regular punisher, as well as the regular protector, of the slaves in Rome.

The modern literature connected with Roman Law is of enormous compass, and only a few works most likely to be of assistance to students whose main interest is in Classical Literature can here be mentioned. The writings named in the Bibliography of the Roman Constitution all deal with some aspects of Law. The articles in the Dictionaries there named (p. 299 *supra*) are of especial value to the ordinary Classical student.

Bruns, *Fontes Iuris Romani* (ed. 7, 1909), which brings together inscriptions and fragments relating to Roman Law, is an indispensable text book. The text of Gaius is included in Huschke's *Iurisprudentia Anterustiniana* (1861 etc.) with Index by F. Fabricius (1868 etc.).

For Criminal Law, Mommsen's *Römisches Strafrecht* (1899) is exhaustive. A useful summary of Civil Procedure is that in *Der Römische Civilprocess* by L. v. Keller (ed. 5, 1876), where abundant references are given, including those to ordinary non-legal ancient literature. Besides these may be mentioned Muirhead, *Historical Introduction to the Private Law of Rome* (1886); Greenidge, *The Legal Procedure of Cicero's Time* (1901); E. C. Clark, *Early Roman Law* (1872), and *History of Roman Private Law* (1907); Cuq, *Institutions Juridiques des Romains* (1891), and Roby, *Roman Private Law in the Times of Cicero and the Antonines*, 2 vols. (1904). Girard's *Manuel de droit Romain* is better suited for legal than for classical students.

### VI. 3. FINANCE.

498. POLYBIUS (vi 13) in his account of the Roman constitution in the 2nd century B.C. mentions first among the prerogatives of the Senate the complete control which it exercised over the public treasury. No payments could be made without its consent to any magistrate except to a consul not on active military service. The sums employed by the censors on public works or on repairs had to be voted by the Senate. No alteration in the terms of a contract concluded by the censors could, at least in theory, be made without the Senate's consent, though we have one instance of an attempt to override by a *plebiscitum* the Senate's authority in a matter of this kind (Livy, xliii 16<sup>1</sup>). Polybius considers that the large number of those who had a financial interest in the public contracts gave a real importance to

Financial  
administration  
under  
Republic.

<sup>1</sup> 169 B.C. This sentence refers solely to the times *prior* to the revolutionary age. In that age, attempts to obtain leave to vary the terms of a contract became more frequent, as in the case of the *publicani* in 59 B.C. (Cicero, *ad Atticum*, i 17, 9; ii 1, 8).

this power of the Senate. It was, again, one of the regular functions of the Senate to decide what sum was to be allotted to a provincial governor for the equipment of his staff and for the other expenses of government.

Apart from the *aerarium sanctius*, in which were stored the proceeds of the *uicesima libertatis* (first imposed in 357 B.C.) as a reserve fund to meet a crisis, the only treasury during Republican times was the *aerarium Saturni*, supervised by the two urban quaestors. It is significant of the attention paid by the Senate to financial matters that it was considered safe to entrust this office to young and untried politicians. Plutarch, in his account of the quaestorship of Cato (*Cato Minor* 16—17), shows that, in spite of the watchfulness of the Senate, the permanent officials of the treasury were apt to take advantage of the inexperience of their nominal chiefs, and to make profit out of their position. Cato did not shrink from expelling or prosecuting disreputable subordinates, and from enforcing the payment of debts due to or by the State. But the quaestor was a purely executive official, and could not in any way direct the financial policy of the State, like a modern Chancellor of the Exchequer. He could hardly become a financial expert during his single year of office. The only other magistrates directly concerned with finance were the censors, whose functions required greater discretion and experience than a quaestor could be supposed to possess. They were entrusted with the task of contracting for the execution of public works, of letting provincial taxes to publicani, and of leasing certain portions of the public domains. Their quinquennial register was the nearest approach which the Romans had to a Budget. But even they had little power of initiative, and, as we have already seen, it was possible for the Senate to revise the terms of the contracts which they had concluded. In this department, as in others, the Roman Republic suffered from the shortness of the tenure of the magistracies, and from the non-existence of a class of expert administrators, such as was developed during the Empire.

499. The Roman Republic adopted the thoroughly vicious practice of letting out the collection of taxes to companies of private individuals, who naturally treated this commission as a source of personal profit. It is as collectors of provincial taxes that the *publicani* are best known, but this was by no means their only, or original, function. They undertook the erection of public buildings, and the performance of other services to the State. As early as 212 B.C. we find the *ordo publicanorum* causing great disturbance in Rome because of the prosecution of one of their number, who had tried to make profit by scuttling the ships in which he had undertaken to convey provisions to the Roman armies (Livy, xxv 3). The history of the later Republic illustrates the enormous influence which these great *societates* could exercise on Roman politics. By 167 B.C. it could be said:—‘Ubi publicanus esset, ibi aut ius publicum uanum aut libertatem sociis nullam esse’ (Livy, xlv 18), and when C. Gracchus in 121 B.C. gave to the *equites* the right of sitting on juries, he

provided the *publicani* with a weapon which they were not slow to use. Cicero's speeches against Verres show in great detail what iniquities they were able to practise in a province, if they obtained the cooperation of a governor whom they could terrorise by the threat of a prosecution on his return to Rome.

500. The companies of *publicani* were very highly organised. The actual bidding was done by a *manceps*, who provided the censor with securities (*praedes*) for the execution of the contract. The nominal chief was an annually-changing *magister* resident in Rome (Cic. *Verr.* ii 182), who was represented in the province by a *pro magistro* (169), under whom was a numerous staff of officials, 'qui operas dabant publicanis', cp. 171. The most influential class of *publicani* were the *decumani* who collected the tithes of Sicily and Asia, 'principes et quasi senatores publicanorum', as Cicero calls them (175). Inferior to these were those who collected the *scriptura* and *portoria*, but sometimes the same company contracted for all three kinds of tax.

501. It is important to realise that there is considerable evidence for the existence of numerous shareholders (*participes*) with a distinct financial interest in the operations of the *publicani*. Polybius (vi 17) says that 'almost all the citizens' were interested in the letting of State-contracts. He mentions a class of persons who τὰς οὐσίας διδῶσιν περὶ τούτων εἰς τὸ δημόσιον, and it is, indeed, quite possible that the Romans understood the principles of a limited liability company. The term *pars* is frequently used by Cicero in the sense of a share in a public company (e.g. *Pro Rab. Post.* 4, 'magnas partes habuit publicorum'). According to him, one of the honourable ways of making an income was *publicis sumendis*, and it has been suggested that his own enormous fortune, which was not inherited, nor to any large extent earned at the bar, was the result of profitable investments. If this is the case, it helps to explain the highly laudatory terms in which Cicero speaks of the *publicani*, whenever he can possibly do so, and the language, which he employs (*Pro Lege Man.* 16, 17 f) to show that the welfare of the Roman people was bound up with that of the Asiatic *publicani*, is most naturally explained, if we suppose that many of his audience were directly interested in their operations. No reform in the methods of provincial government was likely to occur without a revolution, so long as men of all classes reaped a pecuniary profit from the continuance of the evil system.

502. In no department had the introduction of the Empire more beneficent results than in that of finance. It was no longer possible for companies of *publicani* to make large profits by oppressing the provincials, since the direct taxes were now collected by government officials. The *publicani* do not, indeed, disappear under the Empire. They were, for some two centuries, responsible for the collection of harbour-dues throughout the Roman world, and under Nero such complaints arose of the *inmodestia publicanorum*, that the emperor in

Changes under  
the Empire.

a fit of enthusiasm was led to propose the total abolition of the *portoria* (Tac. *Ann.* xiii 50). In the same way the temporary abolition of the Italian harbour-dues in 60 B.C. was the result, according to Cicero (*Ad Q. F.* i 11, 5), not so much of any feeling against the dues as such, as of the misbehaviour of the collectors. Under the Empire the *publicani* still possessed sources of revenue in the working of mines and the collection of corn due to the State (Tac. *Ann.* iv 6), but they were generally under the supervision of imperial *procuratores*, who saw that the terms of the contracts were strictly observed.

503. The division of the provinces by Augustus into the two classes of senatorial and imperial reacted on the organisation of public finance, and early in the Empire we find the distinction between the *aerarium* and the *fiscus*. (1) The *aerarium* remained, as during the Republic, nominally under the control of the Senate, but the emperors exerted an influence over it which increased with time, so that Dio Cassius (writing about 210 A.D.) professes to be unable to distinguish the two treasuries. From the time of Augustus onwards (Mon. Anc. 17), contributions were occasionally made by the emperors to the *aerarium*, and, from the year 56 A.D., it was supervised by praetorian *praefecti aerarii Saturni* appointed by the emperor (Tac. *Ann.* xiii 29). Previously his control had been less direct. From 28 to 23 B.C. the Senate had appointed *praefecti* from men of praetorian rank; from the latter date till 44 A.D., two of the praetors had managed the *aerarium*, and, between 44 and 56 A.D., a return was made to the republican method of appointing quaestors. Under the early Empire the *aerarium* was maintained primarily by the revenues of the senatorial provinces, and several sources of income, such as the property of condemned criminals and lapsed inheritances, originally fell to it, but were afterwards diverted to the *fiscus*. A special treasury called the *aerarium militare* was instituted by Augustus in 6 A.D. He contributed 170 million sesterces to its foundation (Mon. Anc. 17), and devoted to its maintenance the proceeds of a 5% tax on inheritances and a 1% tax on sales (Tac. *Ann.* i 78). The primary object of this treasury was the payment of pensions to discharged soldiers.

504. (2) The *fiscus* was the special treasury of the emperor. Its main source of income was the revenues of the imperial provinces, but we find imperial *procuratores* in senatorial provinces (e.g. Tac. *Ann.* iv 15), and it is certain that, even there, the *fiscus* had certain claims. Whether or not Mommsen is right in holding that the *fiscus* had a share in the *tributum* of the 'public' provinces, it was at any rate necessary that a representative of the emperor should be on the spot to collect the revenues of the imperial domains and other moneys which fell to the *fiscus*. The *fiscus*, as a whole, was administered by an official called at first a *rationibus* and afterwards *rationalis*, who was originally a freedman, but, from the time of Hadrian, a man of equestrian rank. A distinction existed between the *fiscus* proper and the *patrimonium Caesaris*.



The latter consisted of property which belonged to the emperor in a special sense, as having been, for instance, left to him by will. Thus Agrippa bequeathed the Thracian Chersonese to Augustus, and Egypt was attached to the person of the emperor in a closer way than any other Caesarian province. The *fiscus* and the *patrimonium* were administered from the beginning by separate sets of officials, until, under Septimius Severus, a distinction was made between the *res privata* and the *patrimonium*, after which the administration of the *patrimonium* was probably merged in that of the *fiscus*. The private property of the emperors was under the supervision of an enormous number of *procuratores*, whom the inscriptions enable us to trace in every part of the Empire. (On the administration of the *fiscus* &c. see O. Hirschfeld, *Die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*, pp. 29—47, and cp. H. Stuart Jones, *Roman Empire*, pp. 248—9.)

505. Turning to the consideration of the sources of the Roman revenues, we must note that, between the year 167 B.C. and the reign of Diocletian, it was a well-established principle that Roman citizens resident in Italy were free from all direct taxation. Sources of revenue. The *tributum*. Until the former year, Romans might be called upon to pay, at least occasionally, a *tributum* for the maintenance of the armies of the State. A regular tax of this character was probably levied for the first time in the year 406 B.C., when pay for the soldiers was introduced (Liv. iv 59 f), and may not have been imposed when no war was on foot, or the treasury was sufficiently full. There are instances of repayment of at least part of the tribute out of the booty gained in war, and some authorities hold that the tax was regarded as being of the nature of a loan. For the purpose of this tax a return of the property of citizens was necessary. Originally, the only objects included in the census (*censui censendo*) were land and the slaves and animals connected with it (*res mancipi*); but, as a commercial class developed, the scope of the census was widened so as to include other kinds of wealth. Thus the elder Cato in his censorship imposed a heavy tax on articles of luxury. The soldiers, at least in early times, received their pay at the hands of *tribuni aerarii*, a name which recurs at the end of the Republic as the designation of an *ordo* which possessed a seat in the jury courts. Probably a certain property qualification was required of all candidates for the post of paymaster. Mommsen is inclined to identify the *tribuni aerarii* with the officials afterwards known as *curatores tributum*. In 167 B.C. the wealth gained by the victory of Aemilius Paulus in Macedonia induced the Senate definitely to abolish the *tributum*.

506. A large part of the income of the Roman State in Republican times was derived from the public lands in Italy. The Italian conquests of Rome had always been followed by the confiscation of a part of the territory of the conquered State. Public land in Italy. Some of the *ager publicus* thus acquired was in course of time alienated in one or other of several ways. It might be devoted to the foundation of a

colony intended to strengthen the hold of Rome on the district where it was settled. In such cases the land became the private property of the colonists. Or, again, as under the Gracchan law, individuals might receive from the State allotments, which usually ceased to be in any sense public land. Lastly, public land might be sold by the quaestors at the command of the Senate. This *ager quaestorius* remained in theory the property of the State, and paid a nominal rent. Apart from these exceptions, all land in Italy not belonging to subject communities was *ager publicus*. Of this a large part came into the hands of occupiers (*possessores*), who were incapable, in strict law, of owning the land which they occupied, and who were expected to pay to the State a tax of  $\frac{1}{10}$  of their corn and  $\frac{1}{8}$  of their fruits. In course of time, however, they came to regard themselves as real owners and to treat their land as private property. Thus the limits set by the *Lex Licinia* (367 B.C.) to the amount of public land which might be in the hands of individuals were soon disregarded, and the proposal of Tib. Gracchus, that the State should resume much of the *ager publicus* and employ it for the settlement of poor citizens, was regarded by the *possessores* as an act of robbery. Under the early Republic most of the public land was in the hands of the patricians, and subsequently in those of the new nobility based on wealth and office: and, at both periods, complaints frequently arose from the classes which considered themselves deprived of property to which they had a right. After the time of the Gracchi the new revenues which poured in from the provinces made the retention of the Italian *ager publicus* less necessary, so that in 111 B.C., by the *Lex Thoria*, practically all the land which had been public property during the tribunate of Tib. Gracchus passed into the hands of private owners. The most important piece of land exempted from this law was the *ager Campanus*, which remained public property until 59 B.C. This land was let on long leases by the censors, who probably fixed the rent which the tenant was obliged to pay, and entrusted to *publicani* the task of collecting it. It is, however, by no means certain whether a definite contract existed between the censor and the tenant, or whether the rights of particular individuals were not merely safeguarded in the contract concluded by the censor with the *publicani*. The *ager Campanus* was distributed to poor citizens under a law of Caesar in 59 B.C., and the last remains of cultivated public lands in Italy were sold or given away by the Flavian emperors<sup>1</sup>. Only certain public pastures remained, the revenues of which (*scriptura*) were collected at first by *scripturarii* and later by *procuratores*.

507. As we have seen (§ 504), it was the enormous increase in the revenues arising from the provinces that enabled the Roman government to abolish the *tributum civium Romanorum* in 167 B.C., and afterwards to transform into private property most of the public land in Italy. The taxation imposed on the pro-

Provincial  
taxation under  
the Republic.

<sup>1</sup> Frontinus, in *Gromatici veteres*, ed. Lachmann, p. 54, 3.

vines was originally regarded as a war-indemnity (Cic. *II in Verr.* iii 6), but, in course of time, the land in the provinces came to be considered as the property of the Roman people, the occupiers of which were bound to pay a rent to the State in the form of taxes. Private property in land was only allowed in districts which possessed the *Ius Italicum*. This change of theory is illustrated by the fact that, at the end of the Republic and under the Empire, provincial communities which enjoyed complete internal autonomy, and were only geographically within the limits of a province, were at the same time liable to be taxed. Cicero declares that the taxation of most provinces barely covered the cost of their administration, and that Asia alone brought a considerable surplus to the Roman treasury (*Pro Lege Man.* 6). Certain classes of land were in a special position, e.g. the *ager quaestorius*, which paid merely a nominal rent and was practically private property, and the *ager a censoribus locatus*, the occupiers of which stood in the same relation to the State as the tenants of the *ager Campanus* discussed above (§ 505), but the greater part of the land within a province was *ager stipendiarius*. On the constitution of a province a *lex provinciae* was drawn up, which enacted once for all the character of the taxation. The most important point to be settled was whether a province was to pay a tithe of its produce (*decumae*), or a fixed sum (*stipendium*).

508. (1) The most important States which paid *decumae* were Asia and Sicily. The *decumae* of Asia were let by the censor in Rome to great companies of Roman *publicani*. On the other hand, the Sicilian tithes were sold in Syracuse, as they had been under Hiero before the Roman conquest, and the collection might be undertaken by local companies, since the *decumae* of each township were let separately. The company which undertook to collect the tithes of a district made an estimate of the probable amount of the harvest, and might gain or lose. This system would not necessarily have pressed heavily on the provincials, had it not been for the illegal exactions of the *publicani*, sometimes abetted by the Roman governor himself. In Sicily, besides the regular *decumae*, the government required the payment of a second tithe (*alterae decumae*), and also a supply of corn for the governor and his suite (*frumentum in cellam*), but, in both of these cases, a liberal price was paid by the Senate, and it required the ingenuity of a Verres to make these exactions a burden to the provincials.

509. (2) Less is known about the administration of those provinces where a definite *stipendium* was imposed. A regular survey of the provinces was not undertaken till the Empire, and we may suppose that the procedure of the Romans in the case of Macedonia was fairly typical. There they started from the previous arrangements, and enacted the payment of half the sum which had been demanded by the native kings. It is not likely that the *publicani* had anything to do with the collection of the *stipendium*, which was probably collected by the individual townships and paid directly to the governor's quaestor. It is

also probable that the *stipendium* was levied primarily on land, for it was sometimes paid in kind. Whether the distinction between *tributum soli* and *tributum capitis* existed under the Republic is doubtful, but the evidence seems to be in favour of the view that land was the normal object of taxation in provinces which paid a *stipendium*, but that, in emergencies, a personal tax might be imposed, either a poll-tax as in Africa in 146 and in Asia during the Civil Wars, or an income-tax as in Syria (Appian, *Syr.* 50).

510. The whole system of provincial taxation was thoroughly reorganised under the Empire, and the most objectionable features of the Republican arrangements disappeared. Julius Caesar abolished the system of tithes in Asia, and probably in Sicily, substituting for the *decumae* a definite *stipendium*. One effect of this change was the disappearance of the *decumani*, the most important class of *publicani*. Under the Empire, as we saw above (§ 502), the *publicani* were confined to the collection of the secondary sources of public revenue, chief among which were the *portoria*, while the tribute paid by the provinces was collected directly by government officials. To secure an equitable incidence of taxation, Augustus, perhaps following the example of Julius, undertook a survey of the whole Empire. Such a survey was specially necessary in the newly-conquered province of Gaul, and we read of the holding of a census there in 27 B.C. and again in 12 B.C. and 14—16 A.D. The object of such a census was twofold; firstly, to collect information as to the extent, legal character, and natural capacity of the land, for the purpose of levying the *tributum soli*; and, secondly, to determine the number and wealth of the population liable to pay the *tributum capitis*. The taking of the census of a province might be supervised by a member of the royal family, e.g. Drusus under Augustus, or by an official appointed specially for the purpose and assisted by a large staff of subordinates. Such officials appear frequently in the inscriptions. Appeals from their decisions probably came before an imperial official known as a *censibus*. The tribute-paying population was divided roughly into the two classes of *possessores* and *negotiatores*, according as they paid *tributum soli* or *tributum capitis*. The latter tax was imposed on all kinds of property—houses, slaves, animals, and ships (Tac. *Ann.* xiii 51). As under the Republic, the provinces were expected to provide corn for the Roman soldiers and officials quartered in them, and Egypt and Atrica had also to undertake the heavy task of supplying the capital with corn for the support of the poorer citizens. Nevertheless, the lot of the provinces with respect to taxation was very greatly improved by the introduction of the Empire. It no longer depended on the caprice of the governors whether the burdens imposed were excessive or not, and the subject-peoples were given the power of bringing complaints before the emperor by means of provincial *concilia*, which were officially recognised by the government, and one of whose regular functions was to express satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the behaviour of a retiring governor.

Changes in  
taxation under  
the Empire.



511. It is certain that all through Roman history the harbour-dues formed an important part of the revenue of the State, but we have little definite information about them before the period of the Empire. Italian harbour-dues are mentioned several times by Livy, who places their introduction in the time of the kings. They were abolished in 60 B.C. on the proposal of Metellus Nepos, because of the extortion practised by the *publicani* by whom they were collected, but were reimposed by Caesar. Under the Empire, as we have seen (§ 502), the *portoria* were still let to *publicani*, and direct collection of the *portoria* seems not to have been introduced till after the end of the Antonine era (Hirschfeld, *op. cit.* p. 81). Under the Republic, it was possible for the governor, by collusion with the *publicani*, to escape payment of the harbour-dues, and Cicero tells us (*II in Verr.* ii 185) that Verres exported from the harbour of Syracuse alone goods worth 1,200,000 sesterces free of export duty. It was customary to impose an *ad valorem* duty on all goods exported and imported, but the amount of this duty varied in the different parts of the Empire. 5% was charged in Sicily, 2% in Spain, and 2½% in Gaul, Asia, Bithynia, and Illyria. Customs duties were levied on the frontiers of the Empire, and also at the frontiers of particular provinces or groups of provinces. Such fiscal units were Sicily, Asia, and the Spanish provinces. Similarly, Moesia, Pannonia, Dalmatia, and Noricum were united for fiscal purposes, but the position of some of the customs-houses suggests that duties were to some extent levied, not only at the frontier of the group, but also within it. Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus formed another group of the same kind. Large profits must have been made at the Egyptian harbours, through which most of the Eastern trade passed. The right of levying harbour-dues for municipal purposes belonged to certain towns throughout the Empire. The *Lex Antonia de Termessensibus*<sup>1</sup> (71 B.C.) shows that a free town might levy such dues, provided that the *publicani* were exempted. We have in a fairly complete form the tariffs imposed in imperial times by the towns of Palmyra, and of Zará in Numidia. The Roman *portoria* seem to have been levied for revenue only and not for the purpose of protection. Heavy taxation of imported corn was never suggested as a remedy for the evil state of Italian agriculture in the Gracchan period.

Indirect taxes.  
Portoria.

512. The only indirect tax which existed in Republican times was the *uicesima libertatis*, a charge of 5% on the value of manumitted slaves, the proceeds of which were devoted to the maintenance of the *aerarium sanctius*. Under the Empire it was at first administered by *publicani*, and afterwards by *procuratores*. Two important indirect taxes were introduced by Augustus, and, from the year 6 A.D., were paid into the *aerarium militare*. These were the *cen-*

Other indirect  
taxes.

<sup>1</sup> Inhabitants of Termessus maior in Pisidia, called *Thermeses* and *Thermenses* in the *Lex* (C. I. L. i 204, Dessau, no. 38).

*tesima rerum uenaliū* and the *uicesima hereditatū*. The former, which was perhaps only levied on goods sold by auction, was reduced to  $\frac{1}{2}\%$  by Tiberius between 17 and 31 A.D., and temporarily abolished by Caligula. The latter was a very important source of revenue throughout the Empire. It was a charge of  $5\%$  on all sums above 100,000 sesterces bequeathed to persons other than near relations, and its introduction was partly due to Augustus' anxiety to encourage matrimony. Its imposition was vigorously opposed, and was only carried by the threat of introducing a direct tribute into Italy. Only Roman citizens paid the legacy-duty, and it is stated that Caracalla's main object in entranchising the whole Empire was to increase the revenue from this source. The only other indirect tax which need here be mentioned was a charge of  $4\%$  on the value of slaves sold.

513. From the earliest times it was considered one of the functions of the Roman government to supervise the supply of corn to the capital, and the *cura annonae* was entrusted to the aediles, occasionally assisted by *praefecti annonae*. At first the needs of Rome were supplied by Italy itself, but, after the conquest of Sicily, that province became the chief granary of Rome. Cicero (*II In Verr.* ii 5) describes it as 'cella penaria reipublicae nostrae, nutrix plebis Romanae'. Special permission was required for the export of Sicilian corn to any other part of the Empire than Rome itself. In Cicero's time the Roman government received annually 6,800,000 *modii* of corn from Sicily, 3,000,000 *modii* of which consisted of the *decumae* paid by the province. Before the time of the Gracchi it was only occasionally that corn was sold below cost price, and the *cura annonae* may even have been a source of revenue to the government. But, after C. Gracchus had passed the first of the long series of *leges frumentariae*, it was a very different matter. Under the *Lex Sempronia* corn was to be sold to the poorer citizens of Rome at  $6\frac{2}{3}$  *asses* the *modius*, about half the price which it cost in Sicily. The price was raised, or the number of recipients lowered, by a *Lex Octavia* of uncertain date, and the whole system was abolished by Sulla. It was, however, restored by a law of 73 B.C., which enacted that 5 *modii* should be sold monthly at  $6\frac{2}{3}$  *asses* the *modius* to a certain number of citizens, and by a law of Clodius in 58 B.C. this price was abolished. It is extremely doubtful how many citizens were entitled to benefit from the *leges frumentariae* in Republican times. A story in Cicero (*Tusc. Disp.* iii 48) suggests that, in the Gracchan period, no one was legally excluded, but it is certain that before the end of the Republic the number of the recipients was limited. Marquardt argues, from the statement of Plutarch (*Cato*, 26) that in 62 B.C. 1250 talents (30,000,000 sesterces) were spent annually on *frumentationes*, that at that date there were 300,000 recipients. Caesar reduced their number from 320,000 to 150,000 (Suet. *Caes.* 41), and Augustus, in spite of his personal objection to corn-doles, raised it again to 200,000, a number which was retained throughout the early Empire. The *plebs frumentaria* is often mentioned as a special class.

Some sources  
of expenditure.  
The corn-  
supply.

514. The aediles, as being mainly municipal magistrates, were not well fitted to administer the *cura annonae* in the fully developed Roman Empire, and it was necessary in 57 B.C. to entrust Pompey with a special commission to superintend the corn-supply. In 22 B.C. Augustus undertook the charge of this department, which was administered at first by *curatores annonae*, but, before the end of his reign, by a *praefectus annonae*, who was one of the most important of the imperial officials of equestrian rank. He had the oversight of the total import of corn, and it has been calculated that of the 60 million *modii* annually imported, only 12 million were required for the free distributions. In times of need the government often sold corn below cost price. The expenses of the *cura annonae* were naturally defrayed by the *fiscus* (Stat. *Siluae* iii 3, 100), but the appearance of *praefecti frumenti dandi ex senatus consulto* in inscriptions of the first two centuries A.D. suggests that the *aerarium* sometimes contributed to the expense.

515. It has been asserted by many writers that this importation of cheap corn from the provinces exercised a most unfavourable effect on Italian agriculture, and there can be no doubt that those districts of Italy which had provided the capital with corn suffered considerably from the working of the *leges frumentariae*. There is, however, a considerable amount of evidence to show that these evil effects did not extend over the whole peninsula. It is significant that the first *lex frumentaria* was passed on the proposal of C. Gracchus, who had the interests of Italian agriculture very much at heart, and the decline of agriculture during the 2nd century B.C. may be sufficiently explained as the result of the increasing employment of cheap slave-labour and of the obligation to serve in the army. It is not likely that at any time the prosperity of Italian agriculture as a whole was dependent on the demand of the capital, and it is only with the capital that the *leges frumentariae* were concerned. In the absence of good means of transport it is improbable that the Italian farmer aimed at more than supplying the wants of his own household and of the market of the neighbouring town. The early emperors did much to encourage agriculture, and the younger Pliny (*Paneg.* 31) informs us that, in the time of Trajan, corn was actually exported from Italy to Egypt during a famine in that country. The sums devoted by Nerva and the succeeding emperors to *alimentationes*, the support of poor children, were invested in Italian land, and we know that a benefaction made by the younger Pliny for this purpose yielded an interest of 6% (Plin. *Ep.* vii 18). (On this subject see Salvioli, *Le capitalisme dans le monde antique*, Paris, 1906.)

516. Under the Republic little outlay was involved in the expenses of government. The city magistrates served without pay, and were often expected to devote large sums from their private income to the celebration of games. On the other hand, provincial governors received a substantial remuneration. The Senate set aside a fixed sum for the expenses of a provincial government, part of which

Expenses of  
government.

consisted of a salary paid to the governor (*uasarium*), while part was employed in the purchase of corn for the governor and his staff. It was possible for an unscrupulous governor to make considerable profit to himself by using the difference between the market-price of corn and the price fixed by the Senate (Cic. *II in Verr.* iii 188—222), and even Cicero, who showed great rectitude in his government of Cilicia, was able to gain two million sesterces in his single year of office (*Ad Fam.* v 20). Under the Empire the expenses of government became a much heavier charge on the public treasury. The numerous *praefecti* and *curatores*, who undertook many of the duties of the Republican magistrates, were undoubtedly paid, and much of the work which, during the Republic, had been done by the *publicani* was now undertaken by paid officials. It is doubtful whether men of senatorial rank received any remuneration for work done for the government within the city, but a definite salary was certainly offered to governors of provinces (Tac. *Agr.* 42). The imperial *procuratores* received sums varying from 60,000 to 300,000 sesterces *per annum*, and a reference to their salary is often included in their official titles. A new source of expense arose when it became necessary to appoint special officials to supervise the affairs of municipal towns (*correctores rerum publicarum*). Previously these towns had cost the State nothing, and had defrayed the expenses of their administration from local taxes and the revenues of their own property.

**517.** Pay for the Roman infantry was first introduced in 406 B.C. during the war against Veii. The allies received food, clothing, and arms free of charge, but, in the case of the Roman soldiers, the cost of these necessities was deducted from the pay (Polyb. vi 39). In the time of Polybius the annual pay of a legionary was 120 *denarii*. This was raised by Caesar to 225, and by Domitian to 300 *denarii*, *per annum*. A rise in pay was rendered inevitable by the fact that, under the Empire, the army consisted of professional soldiers with no source of income except what they received from the government. Again, as has been shown above (§ 503), under the Empire it became necessary to make special provision for veterans, and in 6 A.D. the *aerarium militare* was constituted for the purpose of providing them with pensions. It is impossible to state with any accuracy what was the actual outlay on the army, but it has been calculated that the pay of the ordinary soldiers in the 25 legions which existed under Tiberius amounted to about 160 million sesterces.

**518.** The maintenance of religion was always regarded at Rome as one of the most important duties of the State, and this obligation must have involved a considerable outlay. The members of the great priestly colleges were, indeed, unpaid, but considerable remuneration was given by the State to those who in a humbler capacity devoted themselves to the service of religion. The cost of the maintenance of religious ceremonies was to a large extent defrayed from

Expenses of  
army.

Other sources  
of expenditure.



the revenues of temple-property, but the theory seems to have prevailed that such temple-property (*loca sacra*) was really the property of the State, which could sell or alienate it at a time of crisis. The public games came to be in the course of the Republic an increasingly heavy burden on the treasury in spite of the lavish expenditure of money by the presiding magistrates, and the cost of extraordinary religious ceremonies intended to avert disaster or to celebrate a victory was naturally paid from the public funds.

519. It has already been noticed (§ 498) that one of the functions of the censors was to exercise an oversight over the execution of public works. In Rome itself the State was responsible for the upkeep of all public buildings, as well as for the water-supply and the drainage, while, outside the city, it was bound to maintain in good repair roads, bridges, and harbours. Polybius states that, in his time, such expenses formed the heaviest burden on the Roman treasury, and, during the troubled times which preceded the fall of the Republic, these duties were neglected by the impoverished government, with the result that Augustus was forced to undertake building operations on a large scale within the city, and even to come to the assistance of the *aerarium* in the task of keeping the roads of Italy in good repair. His example was followed by succeeding emperors and by many private individuals, who devoted large sums to the erection of temples and other public buildings in Rome itself and throughout Italy. One of the most pleasing features of the early Roman Empire was the willingness shown by individual Romans to undertake tasks, the cost of which would otherwise have been a very heavy burden on the public treasury.

A fuller treatment of the subjects discussed above may be found in the following works:—Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, vol. ii, ed. 2, Leipzig, 1884; O. Hirschfeld, *Die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*, Berlin, 1905; Cagnat, *Les impôts indirects chez les Romains*, Paris, 1882; Rostowzew, *Geschichte der Staatspacht in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (*Philologus*, Suppl.-Band ix, p. 329 f); Salvioli, *Le capitalisme dans le monde antique*, Paris, 1906; Deloume, *Les manieurs d'argent à Rome*, Paris, 1892; Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, Leipzig, 1888.

Select bibliography.

## VI. 4. POPULATION.

### A. OF ROME.

520. It is impossible to determine the population of ancient Rome at any given period with the accuracy possible in the case of a modern city. No trustworthy statistics for the whole population are available. Hence it is not surprising to find that those who have made a special study of the question differ very widely in their conclusions. All that can be done here

Population of Rome.  
Absence of trustworthy statistics.

is to indicate the chief methods of inquiry and to state some of the results arrived at.

521. Perhaps the most trustworthy method of calculation is that which seeks to determine the total population from the number of persons receiving free distribution of grain or largesses at a particular date. Information as to the number of recipients at such distributions is available from the end of the Republic to the beginning of the third century after Christ. In 5 B.C., according to the statement of Augustus on the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, 320,000 persons received a gratuity of 60 *denarii* each. From these figures Beloch draws the following conclusions. He assumes that the recipients represent the entire male citizen population of Rome (excluding senators and knights), an assumption not improbable, when we find inscriptions such as that on a sepulchral urn in the British Museum, where a father proudly records the fact that his three-year-old son had received his portion of corn on such and such a date. The female population may, on modern analogy, be reckoned at about 250,000. There remain slaves, *peregrini*, and the garrison. The numbers of the first are most uncertain, but, accepting Galen's statement as to the proportion of slaves at Pergamum in his day as a not untrustworthy criterion, we may perhaps assume that the slaves numbered about half the free population—say 280,000. The *peregrini* might number about 70,000, but they may be left out of the calculation in view of the fact that about an equal number of dwellers in the districts outside Rome would be included among the recipients of the *congiaria*. The garrison numbered 20,000. With these figures before him Beloch (who finally reduces the citizen population to 500,000) estimates the population of Rome in the age of Augustus at some 800,000 persons. He arrives at a similar result by two other methods of calculation. (1) The area of ancient Rome, as enclosed by the Aurelian wall, was about 3075 acres. A population of 800,000 gives a density of 260 persons to the acre, a density which is regarded as likely under the circumstances prevailing. This is considerably greater than the density of population in the most crowded part of modern London. Bethnal Green has only a population of about 170 to the acre. (2) The *canon frumentarius populi Romani* under Septimius Severus gives an annual consumption of 27,375,000 *modii* of wheat. Beloch thinks that 36 *modii* per person *per annum* would be a fair allowance. This would mean a population somewhat under 800,000.

522. That these results cannot be regarded as final is only too clear. Marquardt (following Friedländer) starts from the 320,000 recipients of the *congiaria*, and takes the figures to represent the number of citizens. To these he adds about 300,000 women and children, 10,000 senators and knights, the garrison of 20,000, 900,000 slaves (a far more probable estimate than Beloch's), and 60,000 *peregrini*—a total of 1,610,000. Nissen's estimate is 1,200,000—1,300,000. It may be added that Gibbon, founding his conclusions on the number of *domus* and *insulae* as recorded

Methods of  
enquiry, and  
their results.

in the fourth century after Christ, conjectured that the population of Rome at that period was about 1,200,000.

523. Such are the conclusions arrived at by some of those who have made an estimate of Rome's population. The 800,000 given by Beloch may certainly be regarded as below the mark—on account of the under-estimate of the slave population, if for no other reason. Perhaps the scholars who set the population of Rome in the age of Augustus at about 1,200,000 are the safest guides. One thing is certain, that the ancient city, at the height of its prosperity, far exceeded modern Rome in populousness. The census of 1901 gave a population of only 463,000 persons.

#### B. OF ITALY.

524. It is, perhaps, hardly worth while to attempt to estimate the total population of Italy prior to the census following the incorporation of the Italians as Roman citizens (70—69 B.C.). It is true that Beloch, founding his calculations on the list of allied contingents taking part with Rome in the Gallic war of 225 B.C., concludes that the total population of Italy at that date was about 2,700,000—a number which Nissen would at least double. The census of 70—69 B.C. gives a male citizen population of 910,000. Beloch therefore, taking these figures to represent about a third of the total citizen population, concludes that it must have remained practically stationary from 225 B.C. to this date. He thinks that, in 70—69 B.C., there may have been about  $4\frac{1}{2}$  million inhabitants in Italy, slaves included. Such an estimate is probably far too low, but there is no real criterion whereby the numbers of the non-citizen element of the population can be determined.

Population of  
Italy.

The census of 70—69 B.C. was the last taken under the Republic. The next trustworthy information is supplied by the census-lists drawn up under Augustus and recorded by him on the *Monumentum Ancyranum*. The census of 28 B.C. registered 4,063,000 *civium capita*<sup>1</sup>. The increase of population after 70—69 B.C. is so extraordinary that some explanation is clearly demanded. Beloch, on the one hand, considers that Augustus must have included women and children, who had not been reckoned in Republican times. Nissen, on the other, supposes that all persons with property, that is widows and orphans as well as adult males, were counted, but not the bulk of women and children. Beloch, in accordance with his theory, assumes a total population of not more than  $5\frac{1}{2}$  millions (including slaves) at the date of this census. Nissen, who attempts to back his

<sup>1</sup> The other two census-lists of the *Monumentum Ancyranum* are of interest as showing the steady increase in the population, viz.—

8 B.C.—4,233,000.

14 A.D.—4,937,000.

The census of 47 A.D., as recorded by Tacitus, gave a population of 5,984,072. It is clear that there was a consistent growth under the early Empire.

conclusions by comparing the known numbers of Roman colonists in various districts with the numbers of the inhabitants in the same districts at the present day, gives very much higher figures—a total population of 16 millions. The great divergence of the estimates of the two scholars named depends mainly upon two points, viz. their different interpretations of the meaning of *civium capita* in the census-lists of Augustus, and their conflicting views as to the number of slaves. Probably a truer estimate would lie somewhere between the two extremes. Such are the numbers given by two previous inquirers on this subject, E. von Wietersheim and Dureau de la Malle. The former assigned a population of about 11 millions to Italy at the beginning of the Empire; the latter, one of  $9\frac{1}{2}$  millions. These estimates should be contrasted with the population of modern Italy, which in 1901 was about 32,000,000. Nissen's distribution of the 16 millions reckoned by him is of interest. He would assign about 7 millions to N. Italy, 3—4 millions to Regio I (Latium, Campania, and Picenum), 5—6 millions to the rest of Italy. Besides Rome, with its population of about 1,200,000, there would be some ten large towns with a population of about 100,000 each, viz. Patavium, Verona, Mediolanum, Ravenna, Bononia, Mutina, Ostia, Capua, Puteoli, and Neapolis.

525. In conclusion, something may be said as to the density of population in particular districts of Italy. Apart from Rome and its immediate vicinity, the most thickly populated district was, in ancient times as at the present day, Campania. Latium and Etruria had once been very thickly peopled, but in the last centuries of the Republic became deserted, a fact expressly noted by both Cicero and Livy. The elder Pliny asserts that Picenum had as many as 360,000 inhabitants in the third century B.C.; though the actual figures may not be trustworthy, the district was evidently well populated. The cities of southern Italy flourished up to the fourth century B.C., but thenceforward steadily declined. The most thinly inhabited part of Italy was, according to Cicero, Apulia, where the only towns of any considerable size were Brundisium and Venusia. Gallia Cisalpina, on the other hand, was in Cicero's day the seat of a most flourishing population, and is called by him *flos Italiæ, firmamentum imperii populi Romani, ornamentum dignitatis*. Strabo considered that it surpassed all the rest of Italy in population, in size of cities, and in wealth.

### C. OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

526. The following table reproduces Beloch's estimate of the population of the Roman Empire at the death of Augustus (14 A.D.).

Population of the Roman Empire.	The approximate nature of the numbers given is self-evident. We have seen that, in the case of Italy, the population was probably under-estimated (§ 524). It is interesting to note that the population of the Roman Empire as here given corresponds very
---------------------------------------	---



closely to the estimated white population of the British Empire at the beginning of the present century, viz. 52,000,000. For the evidence upon which the following figures are founded the reader must refer to Beloch's work mentioned below.

POPULATION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE (14 A.D.).

1. *In Europe.*

Italy	...	...	...	...	6,000,000
Sicily	...	...	...	...	600,000
Sardinia and Corsica	...	...	...	...	500,000
Spain	...	...	...	...	6,000,000
Narbonensis	...	...	...	...	1,500,000
Tres Galliae	...	...	...	...	3,400,000
Danubian provinces	...	...	...	...	2,000,000
Greek peninsula	...	...	...	...	3,000,000
					<u>23,000,000</u>

2. *In Asia.*

Province of Asia	...	...	...	...	6,000,000
Rest of Asia Minor	...	...	...	...	7,000,000
Syria	...	...	...	...	6,000,000
Cyprus	...	...	...	...	500,000
					<u>19,500,000</u>

3. *In Africa.*

Egypt	...	...	...	...	5,000,000
Cyrenaica	...	...	...	...	500,000
Africa	...	...	...	...	6,000,000
					<u>11,500,000</u>

TOTAL. 54,000,000.

Hume's *Essay Of the Populousness of Ancient Nations* (valuable as correcting previous exaggerated estimates of ancient population); Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, p. 92 ff; Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*; Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, ii (1) 99 ff; Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, ii<sup>2</sup> 117 ff. References to the earlier literature on the subject will be found in the books above-mentioned. Pöhlmann, *Die Übervölkerung der antiken Grossstädte* (Preisschrift No. xxiv, Jablonowski'sche Gesellschaft zu Leipzig) has some interesting remarks on the population of ancient Rome in its economic aspect.

## VI. 5. ORDERS OF SOCIETY.

## A. UNDER THE REPUBLIC.

527. SOCIAL distinctions are much in evidence from the very beginnings of Roman history. Yet, under the earlier Republic, the cleavage was not so irreparable as in later times, because the disparity of wealth, which afterwards became so conspicuous, had not yet come into existence, while there were common military and agricultural interests which tended to draw all classes together. At the very outset, however, the State is sharply divided into two orders of citizens engaged in a strenuous struggle. On the one hand is a set of privileged persons called patricians, belonging to certain clans or houses known as *gentes*; on the other is the great body of citizens called plebeians. The patricians form a very exclusive aristocracy, whose members are at first not permitted to marry outside their own rank. They possess a monopoly of the magistracies and priesthoods; they do their best to gain exclusive possession of the State-lands and to oppress the plebeians by stringent enforcement of the law of debt. The internal history of the early Republic is the history of the sweeping aside of patrician monopoly and the gradual fusion of the two orders. By the *Lex Hortensia* of 287 B.C. the fusion seemed complete. Yet events proved that it was but a prelude to a new division of society.

528. The old patrician aristocracy indeed disappeared. In its stead there arose a new aristocracy, composed of those patricians and wealthier plebeians who won their way to office and thence into the Senate. It became a fixed custom to fill up the ranks of the Senate mainly with those who had attained to curule office; hence the gradual creation of a new *nobilitas*, which was far from being confined to members of the old patrician houses. Side by side with these were found members of plebeian families such as the Metelli and Livii. Little by little the circle of these ennobled families became practically a fixed one, with the result that a ruling senatorial caste came into being. Such was the first order of Roman society at the time of the Gracchi.

529. Meanwhile the changed economic conditions brought about by Rome's conquests abroad led to the creation of a second definite order beneath that of the nobility. By the Claudian law of 218 B.C. senators and senators' sons were formally debarred from speculative undertakings abroad. A great field of enterprise was thus opened up to the class beneath them. The traders (*negotiatores*) and farmers of taxes (*publicani*) amassed vast wealth at the expense of the provincials. It remained for Gaius Gracchus to establish this class of men as a separate order (the equestrian), by giving non-senators, who possessed

Orders of  
Society under  
the Republic.  
Patricians and  
Plebeians.

The new  
aristocracy.

The knights.

the qualifying census of 400,000 sesterces, the exclusive control of the jury-courts, and thus setting them in direct antagonism with the senatorial order. For it is obvious that members of this new order had, as judges, an almost complete control over the fortunes of a senatorial provincial governor.

530. Beneath these first two orders came a third, that of the *plebs urbana*, a motley crowd composed at once of respectable artisans and small tradesmen, ruined peasants from the country districts, and of a miscellaneous rabble attracted to Rome by the prospect of getting from the corn-doles a living which they had not earned. In the hands of this third class was centred most of the voting power (for they were ever on the spot to exercise their right), and they occupy a position of bad eminence in those scenes of turbulence which were so disgraceful a feature of the last years of the Republic.

The *plebs urbana*.

The class of freedmen will be more conveniently described in the account of society under the Empire, and slaves will be reserved for a separate section.

#### B. UNDER THE EMPIRE.

531. Under the Empire social distinctions became much more rigid and sharply defined, reminding us in many ways of the sharply-divided orders of 18th century France. It was Augustus who created a legally constituted senatorial order, admission to which was entirely dependent on the will of the emperor. Entrance to it was given by the granting of the right to wear the *toga* with the broad purple stripe (*latus clavius*). The sons of senators received this distinction of right; on others it was bestowed by the emperor at will (*adlectio*). Hence it was that, while the old Republican nobility steadily died out, a new peerage came into existence, created by the emperor. The new senatorial order included a senator's wife and his descendants in the male line up to the third degree. Within the order itself there were four divisions, according as its members had attained to consular, praetorian, tribunician, or quaestorian rank. From Nero's time onwards the consuls were nominated by the emperors, who also made promotions from one rank to another, generally by way of reward for service done to them. Yet, in spite of the changed conditions, a scion of an anciently ennobled family commanded a peculiar respect, and it was not an uncommon practice for the newly ennobled to have recourse to a fictitious genealogy. The possession of a property qualification of a million sesterces (say £8000) was a condition for membership of the order, a fact which explains the not infrequent subsidising of impoverished senatorial families by the emperors. The letters of the younger Pliny show with what extraordinary eagerness home magistracies were sought after, but in general the position of the senatorial order under the Empire may be described as one of much outward distinction (such as the *latus clavius*, the chief seats, at the public games, and the title of *clarissimus*), but of little real power.

Orders of Society under the Empire. Senatorial order.

532. As under the Republic, the knights still remained the second order in the time of the Empire. But, in composition and duties, the order differed materially from the equestrian order of the later Republic. Sons of senators ranked as knights from their birth, but, with this exception, the emperors had entire control of admission to the order. The qualifications were the possession of the equestrian census (400,000 sesterces) and free birth, and the applicant had to make formal petition for entry. A special class of knights—called *equites illustres*—seems to have been formed by those (such as Maecenas) who were possessed of the senatorial census, and yet voluntarily remained knights. The knights were employed in the emperor's service, as officers in the army, as governors of the special provinces Egypt, Raetia, and Noricum, as praefects of the city-police and the praetorian guard. The career of a knight named Valerius Proculus may be taken as typical. An inscription tells us that he was successively praefect of a cohort, legionary tribune, *praefectus classis*, procurator of five provinces, *praefectus annonae*, and finally praefect of Egypt. Under Vitellius, and from Hadrian's time onwards, the secretaries of the Imperial household (*ab epistulis*, *a libellis*, *a rationibus*) were drawn from the order of knights; previously they had been freedmen.

533. Below the knights came the *plebs urbana*. It must not be supposed that its members were all idle and dependent for their living on largesses. In its rank would be found members of professions such as schoolmasters, teachers of rhetoric, architects, physicians, etc., as well as many of the tradesmen whose callings are so frequently specified on their tombstones. But such had to face heavy competition on the part of freedmen and slaves. Lower in the scale came the *plebs* par excellence, the *plebs quae frumentum accipiebat*. Nominally still invested with the right of electing magistrates, this class devoted most of its attention to the distributions of grain and to the public shows. The creation, however, of city-wards (*vici*) by Augustus and the appointment of ward-magistrates (*vicorum magistri*) gave the *plebs* some opportunity of taking an interest in municipal life.

534. Roman slaves were, as a rule, manumitted with great facility. Even as early as 220 B.C. the voting power of freedmen was such that it was found advisable to restrict them to the four city-tribes. But their power as a class really dates from the Empire. Augustus was forced to devote special attention to their position. On the one hand, he endeavoured to check their increasing numbers by placing restrictions upon the proportion of slaves who might be freed by testament, notably in the *Lex Fufia Caninia* (dated by a recently discovered inscription to 2 B.C.). On the other, he tried to define their social position more clearly by forbidding their intermarriage with members of the senatorial order, while allowing it with other persons of free birth. He strictly prohibited the holding of magistracies by them, whether at home or in the



provinces; at the same time, he opened a way for their aspirations by the creation of the *ordo Augustalium*, a kind of freedman-aristocracy, which, in return for its position of dignity, undertook various municipal burdens throughout the towns of Italy and the provinces. Trimalchio, the freedman immortalised by Petronius, was a *seuir Augustalis*; and freedmen are constantly described on their tombstones as having attained to this dignity. But, in Rome itself, freedmen won a far more substantial position for themselves. This was primarily due to the wealth they amassed by trade, to which they devoted most of their energies. Some idea of the extent to which the business of Rome was in their hands may be gained by a study of the inscriptions relating to freedmen. Often they were employed by senators to undertake trades from which they themselves were excluded. Brought into prominence by their wealth, for the first few decades of the Empire they exercised considerable political influence in an indirect manner. The emperors, especially Claudius and Nero, put the most important offices of their households under the charge of freedmen, who controlled the correspondence, the revenues, and the department of petitions. In this way a Pallas and a Narcissus were able to amass vast fortunes and to exercise a wide-felt influence. Nor was the influence of freedmen confined to a few exalted individuals; the satires of Juvenal show the power which their wealth gave them in society, where they were courted to the exclusion of the poor man of free birth.

535. A sharp line of distinction was drawn between society in the capital and society in the towns of Italy and the provinces. The dweller in Rome felt himself entitled to look down upon the municipal, and the municipal had an equal contempt for the provincial. Juvenal, by way of disparagement, calls Cicero a 'municipalis eques' (viii 238), and Cicero had himself observed: 'You see how we are all looked down upon, we who are of municipal origin' (*Phil.* iii 15). One of the acts which most roused popular feeling against Julius Caesar was his introduction of Gauls into the Senate; and Seneca, in his satire on the dead Claudius, charges him with having determined to bestow Roman citizenship upon all Greeks, Gauls, Spaniards and Britons. The feeling was perhaps a natural one, but must have been considerably weakened by the accession of emperors of provincial origin.

Municipals  
and  
provincials.

536. Society in municipal towns was organised mainly on a basis of wealth. At Como the possession of 100,000 sesterces was a necessary qualification for admission into the Senate of the town. An exaggerated regard was paid to grades of dignity and a sharp line was drawn between the *honestiores* and the *tenuiores*. The precision with which petty positions of dignity are enumerated upon the tombstones is an index of the prevailing tone, and recalls the passion for petty distinctions which prevailed among the French middle classes of the 18th century, when the periwig makers of La Flèche ceased working in a body in order to show 'how justly they were aggrieved at the precedence granted to the bakers'.

Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to M. Aurelius*; Inge, *Society in Rome under the Caesars*; Furneaux, *Annals of Tacitus*<sup>2</sup>, i ch. vii 100 ff; Bibliography. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*<sup>3</sup>, i 225-405; Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, iii 458 ff; for evidence as to trades, etc., cf. especially Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. Sel.*, ii (2) p. 771 ff. Much that is helpful will be found in Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome* (Eng. trans.); Pelham, *Outlines of Roman Hist.*; Greenidge, *Hist. of Rome* (B.C. 133-70), vol. i; Waide Fowler, *Social Life at Rome in the age of Cicero*.

## VI. 6. SLAVES.

**537.** SLAVES were doubtless employed by the Romans from the earliest period of their history, but at first their numbers must have borne a relatively small proportion to those of the citizens. Sources of supply. This follows from the fact that Rome was in early times essentially an agricultural community composed of a number of small farmers. Each of these, aided by the members of his family, did a large proportion of the farm-work with his own hands, though he was not infrequently called away to join in military operations. The first Roman slaves were drawn mainly from prisoners of war, captured in conflicts with the surrounding peoples. Thus Livy tells us that after the fall of Veii the dictator Camillus put up the free population to auction. The slave-supply would also be kept up to some extent by children born to slaves in the house (*uernae*), a class of slaves which was usually treated with special indulgence by their masters. Slaves were besides furnished in the persons of those unhappy citizen debtors who were sold into slavery to satisfy the claims of their creditors. As time went on, the demand for slaves steadily grew. By the time of the Licinio-Sextian rogations (367 B.C.), it was found advisable to compel the Roman landowners to employ a certain proportion of free labourers on their estates. With Rome's foreign conquests the area of supply was enormously widened. Great slave-marts, such as Side and Delos, were established; the latter place is said by Strabo to have been capable of importing and exporting tens of thousands of slaves in a single day, so great was the demand on the part of wealthy Romans after the destruction of Carthage and Corinth. The great slave-hunting ground was Asia Minor, where the *publicani* made it part of their business to kidnap vast numbers. Names of slaves, e.g. Ephesius, Lydus, Syra, Thessala, etc., give evidence of the regions whence they were drawn. The victorious generals of the Republic also supplied Rome with trains of captives. Caesar speaks of the appalling fate of Gallic towns in the most matter-of-fact way—'Caesar sold a section of this town; the purchasers reported to him the total as amounting to fifty-three thousand'. The eastern triumphs of Sulla, Lucullus, and Pompeius resulted in the capture of immense numbers of slaves of superior education, while, before their

destruction by the last-named, the pirates of the Mediterranean had kept the market well supplied. It may be noted that Romans of such distinction as the elder Cato had not been ashamed to traffic in slaves as a pure speculation. Plutarch remarks of Cato that 'he made a habit of acquiring many slaves, purchasing by preference those captives who were small and still capable (like puppies or foals) of profiting by nurture and training' (*Cato maior*, 21).

538. It is obviously impossible to name any hard and fast price given for slaves. The sum paid would naturally vary according to supply and demand, and according to the qualifications of the slave purchased. Cato the elder (who, as we have seen, had a very shrewd eye to business) is said never to have given more than 1500 drachms for a slave (£50 or a little more). Columella says that 8000 sesterces (£60—70) was a fair price for a skilled vine-dresser. It is evident that such prices would only be paid for men of really high skill in agriculture. Horace implies that 500 drachms (about £18) was the price of an ordinary slave, and we may perhaps accept this as a fair average. At Oxyrhynchus in Egypt in 77 A.D. an eight-year-old slave-girl was sold for 640 drachms, about £20<sup>1</sup>. A female slave aged 25 fetched 1,200 drachms in 129 A.D.<sup>2</sup> In the time of Justinian there was a fixed scale of prices. Unskilled slaves over 10 years of age were valued at 20 *solidi* (about £12), skilled slaves, such as physicians, commanded as much as 60 (£36). Of course extravagant prices—100,000 sesterces or more—were sometimes given for altogether exceptional slaves.

Prices of  
slaves.

539. Roman slaves were divided into two broad classes according to the nature of their occupations. Those employed on country estates formed the *familia rustica*; those occupied in domestic work in town, the *familia urbana*. To these must be added the numerous slaves engaged in factories or in the service of the State. These last, who were utilised for the making of aqueducts or roads, for police-duty, temple-service and the like, enjoyed special privileges. They received an annual allowance, and also had the right of disposing of half their *peculium* by will. The *familia rustica* for an estate of 240 *iugera*, devoted chiefly to olive-growing and sheep-rearing, is described by the elder Cato as consisting of the slave-bailiff and his wife (*uilicus* and *uifica*) and eleven hands for the general farm-work (*operarii, subulci, opiliones*). Of course, on the large estates which became so common at a later period of the Republic, a very great number of slave-herdsmen was employed. In the year 8 B.C. the freedman C. Caecilius Isidorus left no fewer than 4116 slaves, the greater part of whom must have been employed in tending his huge herds of cattle. It is, however, idle to attempt any close estimate of the number of Roman slaves working either in country or in town. Some conjectures have already been mentioned in the section on population (§ 521 f.). That those engaged in town-service were very numerous is beyond

Occupations  
and numbers.

<sup>1</sup> *Ox. Pap.* 11 no. cclxiii.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* I no. xcv.

question. Tacitus, on more than one occasion, mentions the uneasiness felt by the free population of Rome at the overwhelming numbers of those who were slaves or of servile origin. Athenaeus (no doubt with exaggeration) says that many Romans had from ten to twenty thousand slaves. Horace describes the changeable Tigellius as having at one time a retinue of two hundred, at another one of ten slaves—the latter clearly regarded as a number hardly compatible with respectability. For, with the increase of luxury, the *familia urbana* became minutely subdivided. At the head of the house-slaves was the *procurator*, or sometimes the *dispensator*, himself a slave. It is needless to specify minutely the different classes of indoor servants, ranging as they did from the *ostiarius* or hall-porter to the private medical attendant. Besides these there was generally a special body of outdoor slaves, *pedisequi*, *lecticarii*, etc. A remark made by Cicero in his speech against Piso will serve to indicate the prevailing tone: *nihil apud hunc lautum*, he exclaims, *nihil elegans; serui sordidati ministrant, nonnulli etiam senes; idem coquus, idem atriensis* (27). Degradation, it appears, could hardly reach further.

Slaves were not infrequently employed by capitalists in business speculations. Crassus for example kept 500 slaves specially for building enterprises, and made vast profits out of them. Other slaves were utilised as scribes or bankers, while others were set to work in potteries, spinning and weaving establishments, mines, etc. They were also employed freely as subordinates to the *publicani*.

540. The treatment of slaves must have varied considerably with the economic phases of Roman history. On the early Roman farm they worked in the presence of their masters and were on a footing of some freedom with them. They participated in certain festivals, notably the *Compitalia*, or festival of the cross-roads, and the *Sāturnalia*, at the latter of which master and slaves were for the time being on a perfect equality. But this is the bright side of things. The elder Cato, though outwardly living on terms of considerable intimacy with his slaves, regards them with a revolting callousness. To him they are mere machines, to be thrown aside with other outworn things when old age comes. Far worse must have been the lot of slaves working on the large estates of the later Republic. By day they often had to labour in fetters; by night they were confined in the semi-underground *ergastūlum*. Marriage, except in the case of a few privileged slaves such as the *vīlīcus*, was not recognised, so that parents had no right to rear their offspring. In the words of Mommsen, 'it is very possible that, compared with the sufferings of the Roman slaves, the sum of all Negro sufferings is but a drop'. Such inhuman treatment was bound to produce its effects. Revolts of slaves became frequent and dangerous, such as those in Sicily in 134-2 B.C. and 104-1 B.C. and the revolt of Spartacus in Italy in 73-71 B.C. Slaves employed in town had better opportunities of gaining the affection of their master and a better chance of being manumitted during his life or

Treatment of  
slaves.



at his death. Yet it must be remembered that, under the Republic, the slave had absolutely no legal rights; he was entirely dependent on his master's caprice. We find the door-keeper chained to his post like a dog. Plautus has a most varied vocabulary to express the sufferings of slaves—*uerbera, compedes, molae, magna lassitudo, fames, frigus durum: haec pretia sunt ignaviae* (*Men.* v 6, 9). If a slave ran away to escape the torments of ill-treatment, branding or execution awaited him on recapture. Special precautions were taken to ensure the recovery of such runaways.

541. Against sufferings such as these must be set the hope offered to the slave by the permission to keep his savings (*peculium*), for in this way he had some chance of eventually purchasing his freedom. Educated slaves, moreover, such as those employed as physicians or confidential secretaries, could hardly fail to have considerable influence with their masters. The relations existing between Tiro and Cicero will serve as an illustration. Under the Empire the lot of the slave was gradually ameliorated. Certain legal rights were for the first time accorded to him. He was allowed to marry, to combine with his fellow-slaves in *collegia*, to appeal against harsh treatment on the part of his master. Hadrian punished a mistress for ill-treating her slaves, restricted the application of torture, and in various other ways mitigated the hardships of slavery. Antoninus Pius indeed went so far as to order that a harshly treated slave should be sold to another master. Under Constantine the intentional killing of a slave was reckoned as homicide. Several influences combined to bring about this improvement in the slave's life, but two stand out conspicuously, those of Stoic philosophy and Christianity. Seneca is echoing the tenets of the former when he says 'We are the members of a great body; Nature has made us akin to one another' (*Ep.* 95 § 52). The practical effect of this doctrine is seen in the conduct of the younger Pliny. Writing to a friend he laments the diseases and deaths of some of his slaves. 'I am aware' he says 'that others call such misfortunes a mere loss of property and think themselves great men and wise for so doing. Whether they are great and wise, I know not, but *men* they are not' (*Ep.* viii 16, 3). His consolations are that he has bestowed his manumissions freely, and that he allows his slaves to make wills which he respects as though they were legally binding. The other influence of incalculable force was that of Christianity. The runaway slave Onesimus is to be received back 'not as a slave, but as a brother beloved'. Christianity did not insist upon the actual liberation of the slave, but it did insist that he must no longer be regarded as a mere chattel. This in the long run meant the abolition of slavery.


Blair, *An enquiry into the state of slavery amongst the Romans*; Smith, *Dict. of Ant.*<sup>3</sup>, s.v. *Servus*; Wallon, *Hist. de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, vol. ii; Boissier, *La religion romaine*, vol. ii; Marquardt and Mau, *Privatleben*, 135—195; Becker and Göll, *Gallus*, ii (1881) 115 ff; Buckland, *The Roman Law of Slavery*; Halkin, *Esclaves publics chez les Romains*; Darenberg et Saglio, s.v. *Servi*; Blümner, *Privatallertümer*, 277 ff.

Bibliography.

## VI. 7. THE ROMAN MUNICIPAL SYSTEM.

542. THE free inhabitants of the Roman world (apart from those of the city of Rome herself), and the communities to which they belonged, may be classified as follows:

The Towns of  
the Roman  
State.



543. (1) *Coloniae Romanae*. The distinguishing characteristics of a Roman Colony are origin from Rome and self-government. In the Imperial period 'Colonia' ceases of necessity to imply the former. See 'Roman Colonies', § 573.

544. (2) *Fora*. A *Forum*, in this sense of the word, is a Commune established by a Roman magistrate of his own competence (and in this also differing from a Colony which required a 'lex' for its founding, cf. § 574), with a certain communal organisation (magistrates and local 'senate'), but dependent on the Roman magistrate for jurisdiction. The *Fora* were usually founded on the great military roads (and at the time of their making), especially in Italy and Gaul, e.g. Forum Appii (on the Via Appia); Forum Sempronii, *Fossombrone* (on the Via Flaminia, where it strikes inland from the Adriatic); Forum Iulii, *Fréjus* (on the Via Aurelia, which extended to Arles).

545. (3) *Conciliabula*. A *Conciliabulum* is a centre of meeting of Roman citizens for administrative purposes. It was in a country district, less urban and more spontaneous in origin than the 'Forum', but akin to the latter in organisation and in the fact that its magistrates possessed petty jurisdiction only.

In so far as a *Praefectus iure*<sup>1</sup> *dicundo* might be sent from Rome by the Praetor to both *fora* and *conciliabula*, they might also to this extent be called *praefecturae*. See § 547.

546. (4) *Municipia*. A *municipium* is a town whose citizens possess at least some part of the Roman franchise, and have gained that franchise by

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Roby's *Grammar*, § 465, and Neue's *Formenlehre*, i 298 (1902).

incorporation into the Roman State. It thus differs (*a*) from the Colony, in the origin of its *ciuitas*, and (*b*) from all Latin and 'peregrine' communities, in its possession of the *ciuitas*. This is universally true up to the end of the 2nd century B.C.

The origin of this, by far the most important, class of cities in the Roman world was due to early Rome's military necessities. On the conquest of a neighbouring town Rome's first impulse was to destroy it utterly (*e.g.* Veii in 396 B.C.); or she might leave it independent, as a 'peregrine' community, mulcting it of part of its land; or again, she might transport its inhabitants bodily to Rome (*e.g.* Antemnae under the monarchy). But very soon it became impossible to apply any one of these rough and ready measures. Then Rome conceived the idea of incorporating a subjected city into her own franchise by presenting it with the whole or part of her citizenship. This generosity was dictated by the need of an increased army, as the new citizen became at once liable to service in the legions and to all the other charges on his property and person demanded by the Roman State of its citizen. These charges were known as *munera*; hence the name *municipium*, from *munus* and *capere*. Perhaps in the earliest cases full citizen-rights were bestowed (as at Gabii and Capena). But that the gift was not intended as a privilege, so much as to facilitate requisitions of such services, is shown by the fact that very quickly the citizenship bestowed was a 'limited citizenship', the *ciuitas sine suffragio*, *i.e.* the new citizens could not vote in the Roman assemblies, or, *a fortiori*, stand for office. They possessed, with the *ius prouocationis*, only the *priuata iura* of the *civis* (§ 415). The first town to be incorporated on these terms was Caere in south Etruria in B.C. 353. (Hence the common phrase 'in tabulas Caeritum referre' to express the grant of this limited *ciuitas*.) After this date, town after town was admitted to this status, and consequently the Roman army and territory steadily increased in size. Thus, though the creation of *municipia* was meant rather for Rome's profit than for the subject's good, none the less it was this system alone that led to the growth of the Roman Empire first in Italy and then outside of it, and it was this that made the whole difference between *e.g.* the failure of Persia or Athens as an imperial State and the unique success of Rome. Such indeed was Rome's good fortune that when, towards the end of the Republican period, her statesmen became narrow-minded and wished to stay any further incorporations, the peoples of Italy took up arms, (partly at least) to compel her to continue her ancient practice, and, before it was too late, Rome recognised the necessity. Hence by the *Leges Iulia* and *Plautia Papiria* (B.C. 90—89), and by the senatorial edict of B.C. 86 and Julius Caesar's provision in B.C. 49, the Roman citizenship was obtained by all peoples in Italy south of the Alps. And this practice of incorporation (or the creation of *municipia*) was first encouraged outside Italy by Julius Caesar. Its continuance was largely due to the wisdom of emperors like Claudius and Vespasian,

until finally in 212 A.D. every free inhabitant in the Roman world received the full Roman franchise. It is not too much to say that the creation of the *municipium* of the 4th century B.C. has determined the history of the world ever since.

Thus the title *municipium* itself underwent an extension of meaning. For many years it was used to imply either these incomplete citizen-rights themselves, or, more often, the community possessing those rights (cp. the similar double use of *mancipium*). But from at least the 3rd century B.C. some of the old *municipia* might obtain, some of the new be given, the full *civitas*. And in some laws of the last century of the Republic we not only have *municipium* used loosely as a general term for any kind of Roman town other than Rome herself (e.g. in the *Lex Rubria*, and the *Lex Iulia Municipalis*), but we even hear of 'Latin *municipia*', i.e. towns which have had the *Ius Latinum* bestowed upon them by Rome, 'incorporated' into Latin rights (and thus differing from a Latin colony which has been created with Latin rights; see § 568). This usage is altogether alien from the strict sense of *municipium*, which ought in itself to imply possession of the Roman franchise. These 'Latin *municipia*' first appear in the *Lex Agraria* of 111 B.C., but in the imperial period are found frequently in the provinces. So Salpensa and Malaga are both Latin *municipia* under Domitian. In these two ways the term broadened in usage. Thus Colonies are loosely called *municipia* by Tacitus and Fronto. Finally *municipium* and *municipalis* came to be used as widely as we use the word 'municipal' to-day, in connexion with any local government as distinguished from the central government of the State or the administration of the actual 'capital city'. In this sense the jurists use the terms, and so Tertullian can write 'Noster municipatus in caelis'.

At times under the Republic the magistrates of a *municipium* could be deprived of all save petty jurisdiction, and the higher jurisdiction rested with a *praefectus iure dicundo* sent by the Roman Praetor (e.g. Anagnia, Capua in 210 B.C.). Such *municipia* (called by Beloch 'Aerarii', as distinguished from 'Caerites') might also be called *Praefecturae*.

547. (5) *Praefecturae*. A *praefectura* is a town whose citizens possess the Roman franchise in part at least, but where the jurisdiction is in the hands, not of its own local magistrates, but of a *praefectus iure dicundo* sent from Rome.

This name could therefore be given to towns of other titles, such as *municipia*, *fora*, *conciliabula* (see above). When (as often) it is applied to 'Colonies', the title refers only to that portion of the inhabitants of the colony who are not true colonists (i.e. to those already in the town when the colony is sent there), and who are not blended with the new colony but are given at this time the *ciuitas sine suffragio*. They thus form a subordinate community separate from the self-governing colony, and to these the Prefect administers the law. In such cases (e.g. Mütina) the prefecture forms a distinct class of city community, and it is still found in the 3rd century A.D.



The same Prefect or set of Prefects might be sent to more towns than one. In this sense a *praefectura* may be regarded as a district rather than a town, and the name is thus used by Beloch; but this does not seem to have been the Roman use.

Finally, we may note that, just as *fora* and *conciliabula* are dependent on Rome for their jurisdiction and supervision, so local towns may have smaller communities dependent on them in like manner. Such were called *Vici*, rural communes (e.g. Furfo, Hostilia, a *uicus* of Verona, etc.), or *Castella* (e.g. Castellum Langensium by Genoa), and any town, Roman or non-Roman, might have such dependent upon it (e.g. 83 *Castella* existed in the territory of Carthage). They had local magistrates—*magistri*, *aediles*—for their small village concerns, but are not communal entities. So a town's quarters are called *Vici* (e.g. the 265 of Rome, the 7 of Ariminum) and have their officials, but do not constitute separate towns.

548. (1) *Nomen Latinum*. For the rights and duties implied by the *Ius Latinum* see § 415; *Coloniae Latinae* are explained in § 568, and Latin *Municipia* in § 546. Under the Empire 'Latin rights' were not seldom granted to an alien city as a stepping stone to the acquisition of the full franchise of Rome, at least in the Latin West. But the communal organisation of a city presented with these rights does not seem to have differed from that of a Roman city, and the sketch of local government given below is applicable to both.

B. Peregrini.

549. (2) *Ciuitates liberae*. A 'free State' is essentially one independent of Rome, autonomous and possessed of sovereignty. The distinction between the two kinds of free States is one of the origin and basis of their *libertas*. Those in which it was guaranteed by a treaty with Rome, a *foedus*, were *ciuitates foederatae*. This *foedus* could not be amended or rescinded save by consent of both parties to it or by war, i.e. the freedom was guaranteed by a 'bilateral act'. Those, however, to which it was merely granted by Rome by a law or *senatus consultum* (often as a reward for fidelity or for services in war) were *ciuitates sine foedere liberae et immunes*. The grant could be amended or revoked at pleasure by the Roman government, i.e. the freedom was guaranteed by a 'unilateral act'. The independence therefore of the former class was the more secure.

In theory, and still more in practice as time went on, the free cities did suffer some restrictions on their sovereignty. On federate cities indeed, which possessed a *foedus aequum*, no restrictions were imposed which were not equally imposed on Rome; and to this degree any equal alliance limits the sovereignty of the nations contracting it. But the majority of federate cities were subject to a *foedus iniquum*, i.e. to a treaty which imposed restrictions upon them, which were not similarly obligatory on Rome. Practically this meant that the city's foreign relations were determined by Rome. The freedom, however, of all the free cities guaranteed that their land should be absolutely their own and exempt from any taxation by Rome; that, within their territory, their magistrates possessed complete civil and criminal jurisdiction over their own citizens and aliens, even

though these last should be Romans (unless there was a treaty, law, or decree, expressly excluding the Romans from such jurisdiction, as at Rhodes and Cyzicus). It also guaranteed that no Roman magistrate could enter their territory in any official capacity, save by their own invitation, or make any requisition of any kind from them, unless this had been expressly stipulated; that, within their own territories, they could levy what taxes they liked on whom they liked (unless *e.g.* Romans or 'Latins' were expressly declared to be exempt, as at Ambracia in Epirus in 187 B.C. and at Termessus); that they could issue their own silver coinage (though it seems they could not coin in gold); that they could model their constitution as they liked; and that they could accept as citizens or inhabitants whom they chose.

At one time there were many such free cities in Italy (*e.g.* Tibur, Praeneste, Neapolis). After 49 B.C. they ceased to exist in that country. Outside Italy, the Aetolians (B.C. 189) and Astypalaea (B.C. 105), and, under the Empire, Athens, Sparta, Amisus, Tyre, are examples of federate peoples or cities. Free cities of the second class were, however, far more numerous under the Empire, especially in Asia, Africa, and Achaea (*e.g.* Delphi, Tanagra, Amphipolis, Alexandria Troas). Examples of the laws, etc., constituting such cities survive in the *Lex Antonia de Termessensibus* (B.C. 71) for Termessus in Pisidia, and the *senatus consultum de Aphrodisiensibus* (B.C. 44) for Aphrodisias in Caria. There was also a very hybrid class of towns declared 'free' yet bound to pay the Romans a land tax—*e.g.* Byzantium, Chios, Antioch—but at least until the imperial period only under exceptional circumstances could such a town exist.

550. (3) *Ciuitates stipendiariae*. A 'stipendiary State' is one which pays tribute to Rome. The land is entirely the property of the Roman people, and has together with all the other belongings of the town been surrendered to Rome by a formal act of surrender—*editio*—of the most comprehensive kind (for its terms cp. Polybius xxxvi 2, 2—3; Livy i 38, 2). The usufruct of these is then conceded the town by Rome, but Rome retains the ownership. Thus these towns and their original territory form the *provincia* of the Roman magistrate outside Italy. They are therefore subordinate to and controlled by the provincial governor. But they retain their local constitution; their magistrates wield a local jurisdiction (not, however, in cases where a Roman is concerned); and they can levy taxes on their own citizens. Of such towns there were not many in Italy before its enfranchisement, and then this was but a transitory condition of theirs. But in the provinces the great mass of towns and peoples belonged to this class, at least up to the 2nd century A.D. Thus of 175 towns in Baetica the elder Pliny (under Vespasian) counts 120 as 'stipendiary' while only 3 were 'federate'. All the cities of Sardinia in Cicero's day and 30 out of 32 in Corsica in Pliny's were 'stipendiary'. The number of these of course diminished *pari passu* with the creation of *municipia*, but as, after Augustus, all land in the provinces (unless specially exempted) paid

the land tax, this, which was under the Republic the chief distinguishing characteristic of the *ciuitas stipendiaria*, is distinctive no longer. In literature the chief evidence for the condition of these towns is contained in Cicero's Verrine orations and Cilician letters, and in Pliny's letters to Trajan. As epigraphic evidence we have the two senatorial decrees of October B.C. 170 regulating the affairs of Thisbe in Boeotia, and Cn. Manlius' letter in 188 B.C. to Carian Heraclea consequent on the *deditio* of that town.

551. While the colonies were established by Rome with a fixed type of local constitution modelled closely on that of her own, the *municipia*, and the free and stipendiary cities, tended to preserve their original constitutions. They thus present us with a variety of types. Meanwhile in the Latin West, as earlier in Italy, the tendency to assimilate the local with the Roman constitution was too powerful to be resisted. This tendency is visible in the local constitution of Tarentum about the time of Sulla; and it was crystallised into law (rather than created) by the *Lex Iulia Municipalis* of B.C. 45. Even after this date we find divergences from the common type still existing. Thus aediles (varying too in number) are the chief magistrates at the old prefectures of Arpinum, Formiae, Fundi, etc.; praetors at some towns in Italy (e.g. Ferentinum) and Hispania Tarraconensis and Gallia Narbonensis; a dictator at Lanuvium, Alba, Caere; consuls at Ariminum, Beneventum; *decemviri* in Baetica; *sufetes* in Africa, as at Carthage and Leptis. And the *Lex Iulia* itself recognises such a diversity in local institutions, so far at least as names are concerned. But for the most part the following scheme of local government holds good of Roman and Latin towns in the West and in Italy. For the Greek towns of the East, however, no such general scheme can be formulated. Rome was far too wise to interfere needlessly with local institutions, existing long before the beginning of her relations with the towns concerned. So long as there was uniformity of spirit, there might remain many diversities of operation. Only occasional illustrations therefore of local varieties in the East can here be given.

The  
Municipal  
Organisation.

552. The free inhabitants of a local town consisted of its citizens (*municipes, coloni, ciues*); of resident aliens, who had a domicile in the town or at least possessed lands within its boundaries (*incolae, πάροικοι*); and other strangers, without such domicile or land (*aduentores, ξένοι*). The local citizenship was obtained by birth, or adoption, or manumission, or by direct grant on the part of the town or of the emperor. Thus in 86 B.C., at a time of sore straits, Ephesus bestowed her citizenship on all the strangers in the town. This practice was easier in a Greek city than in one in the West, where the Roman rule held good that no man could be a citizen of more than one *ciuitas*. Occasionally a town would even sell its citizenship, and it is the irony of history that Athens, once the proudest of Greek cities, should be one

A. Classes of  
inhabitants.

of the few known cases of this practice, until Augustus forbade her so to degrade herself. The *incola* enjoyed a very limited right of suffrage in the popular elections, akin to that enjoyed by the Latins in earlier days in Rome. It is only at a very late period in the Empire when the local towns are fast decaying that the *incola* could actually be a magistrate or member of the local Senate. Finally there were the *contributi*, i.e. men not citizens nor *incolae*, but assigned for purposes of control, government, taxation, etc., to a town, and probably resident in the neighbouring country district. This *attributio* was a constant imperial method of controlling the ruder native tribes and civilising them by habituation to government. Then, presently, when differences of culture, etc., had disappeared, they could be amalgamated with the citizens and receive the local franchise and therewith the Roman (or the Latin) as well. Nîmes under Vespasian had 24 *oppida ignobilia* attributed to it, and, in the sub-Alpine districts of Italy under Augustus, Brescia and Trent had tribesmen similarly dependent on them. The Anauni attributed to Trent received the citizenship from Claudius in 46 A.D.

553. (1) *The Magistrates.* In the towns of the West the Roman collegiate principle for the magistracy was well nigh universally observed. The chief magistracy was a board of two *duoviri iure dicundo*, and, below these, two *duoviri aediles*. Sometimes in title these were joined together as *quattuorviri i. d.* or *quattuorviri aediles*. But this does not mean that there were four of each. Sometimes *quaestors* are found as well, to manage the local treasury, usually two, but sometimes 3, 5, or 7, in number. Every fifth year, when the census was taken, the *duoviri i. d.* for the year were given the title *quinquennales*, whose business it then was to fulfil the duties in their town which the censors had performed in Republican Rome. This office, however, does not seem to have existed in any part of Gaul except Gallia Narbonensis. It was the office of greatest honour in the town. Finally, a *duovir* could appoint a prefect to discharge his duties in cases of necessary absence. This prefect must be a *decurion* (see below) not less than 35 years of age. Or the town, by way of compliment, could offer the 'sole duovirate' to the reigning emperor, who, if he accepted it, would send a 'prefect of the emperor' to wield sole authority in the town for that one year. There were also religious magistrates, viz. *Pontifices* and *Augurs*, appointed for life. All magistrates were popularly elected and the secular held office for one year. Re-election within four years was forbidden. Elaborate rules for the conduct of these elections at the town of Malaga are still extant. Bribery was sternly punished. The minimum age for any magistracy varied from 25 to 30. In a town of Latin rights the magistrates received the Roman citizenship on the expiry of their year of office. The duties of the *II uiri* or *IV uiri i. d.* were primarily to administer jurisdiction in all cases save such as might be reserved to Rome (§ 557 *infra*). Like the magistrates of the Roman Republic, they had to

B. The local  
Constitution.



summon meetings of Senate and people, and preside over them; to supervise elections, control the local finance, and, if need be, lead the local forces out to war, as well as provide for the fortification and security of the city. Only a magistrate, it seems, could make a proposal in the Senate. The *aediles* had supervision of the streets, baths, markets, buildings, corn-supply, etc.

The expenses of office, which was unpaid, were considerable, though in compensation the magistrates wore insignia of various kinds and enjoyed various privileges and great esteem. But, though assisted by a large staff of paid clerks, they themselves had not only to pay a fee on election but had to contribute largely towards the expenses of games and festivals during their year of office. Moreover, we often find cases of magistrates who paid more than the necessary entrance fee, or paid *all* the expenses of the games, or gave extra games, or erected public buildings or founded a school at their own expense. And, when one man had bestowed such gifts on his town, it was hard for his successor not to follow his example. Men even beggared themselves rather than refrain from public generosity. The minimum fee for office varied greatly. To be augur at Rusicade (Numidia) cost 34,000 sesterces; at Massilia, 100,000. But a man could be aedile at Theveste for a mere 4000. Only the young quaestor paid nothing, but then he had to deposit caution-money on election.

Gradually the rule was established that only *decuriones* were eligible for office. From the 2nd century onwards, there was a growing reluctance to assume official burdens and responsibilities. With the decline in the number of candidates, nomination by the magistrate took the place of popular election, which survived only in exceptional cases.

In the Greek cities of the East, great variety prevailed in the titles and numbers of the magistrates. Thus we find *ἄρχοντες* (Athens), *στρατηγοί* (Pergamum), *πρυτάνεις* (Miletus), *πολέμαρχοι* (Thebes), *ταγοί* (Thessaly), etc. And even women held office, a practice unknown in the West, and indeed impossible in Rome.

*IV uiri* seems generally to be the title in the Italian *municipia*, *II uiri* in the colonies and in the provincial *municipia*. But *IV uiri* are found at Pompeii and in Latin colonies in Narbonese Gaul, and *II uiri* at the *municipium* of Veii (*C. I. L.* xi 3805); and no absolute rule can be established. The rare appearances of 'Tribunes' and an 'Interrex', or the Colleges of 6 at Assisi, 11 at Nemausus, 20 at Anagnia, etc. etc. cannot here be discussed.

554. (2) *The Senate—Decurions.* In the local town the Senate was almost invariably the 'sovereign body'. Even in the Greek cities Rome encouraged the Senate at the expense of the popular assembly, and thus, at Athens under the Principate, the Areopagus once more becomes an influence in the city.

The title for the Senate varies. In Italian cities it is usually *senatus*; in the Western provinces, *ordo*; in the later Empire, *curia*: in the Greek cities *βουλή* (usually), *σύγκλητος*, or *συνέδριον*. Its members are *decuriones* (usually) or *conscripti*.

A title for admission to the Senate was mainly obtained by the holding of any magistracy. Popular election in the Greek cities tended to disappear (e.g. in Bithynia by Pompey's law). As in Republican Rome, ex-magistrates were chosen into it in order of importance (according to the magistracy held). The choice was made by the local censors, *quinquennales*. To fill up the number of senators, which always was a fixed one, private citizens could then be chosen. These were called *Pedani*, e.g., of 100 senators at Canusium in 223 A.D., 32 were *Pedani*. Or the emperor might nominate a senator. Various qualifications for office existed; the *Lex Iulia Municipalis* contains a long list of disqualifications, such as condemnation at law for various offences, bankruptcy, military degradation, the pursuance of various trades, such as that of an actor, auctioneer, undertaker, etc., or still more degrading pursuits. The decurion must be a citizen of the town (until very late in the Empire this rule is absolute) with a dwelling-place of adequate value as a security, and with property worth 100,000 sesterces. The age limit varied (as it did also in the case of eligibility for a magistracy). Thus, in a Bithynian city, a young magistrate of 22 could become a decurion. But, for private citizens, 30 was the minimum age, until this again was lowered to 25 when, in and after the 2nd century A.D., it became hard to find men willing to be *decurions*, inasmuch as these eventually were made responsible for all the town's debts. Once chosen, a man was decurion for life unless deprived for certain offences by his fellow-decurions or unless specially appointed for a definite period. The number of senators was, in towns of the West and in Italy, usually 100 (as at Canusium, Veii, and Perugia); but at Thamugadi<sup>1</sup> we find 60; at Tymandus, 50 (with hope of an increase), at Castrimoenium, only 30. In the Greek cities numbers were often much greater—450 at Ephesus, 600 at Massilia, even 1200 at Antioch (diminishing later, however, to 60).

The duties of the local Senate were not dissimilar from those of the Roman Senate, as described by Polybius, but were still more extensive. Its decrees were of absolute validity, and concerned all questions of the town's 'foreign relations', finance, public order and security, games and festivals, town-property and buildings, votes of public honours (such as the election of notable benefactors or great men as *patroni* and *hospites*), the sending of public embassies, prosecutions in name of the town, religious administration, and military requirements, save in so far as, in any of these respects, its powers were limited by the control of the central government. Within these limits the decurions were absolute rulers of the town, with the magistrates as their executive, and we are not surprised to find them rejoicing in high-sounding epithets such as *splendidissimus*, *honestissimus*, *sanctissimus*, *κράτιστος*, *ιερώτατος*, etc. At that time local government was not only an

<sup>1</sup> *Thamugadi* appears to have been the original name of *Timgad* (the Pompeii of North Africa). The form *Thamugas* has not yet been found (Cagnat in Boeswillwald, Cagnat and Ballut's *Timgad*, 1903—1905, p. v f).

expensive responsibility, but was also held in high esteem. It was not until the decay of the Empire that men sought to escape nomination as decurions by taking orders in the Christian Church or fleeing to another city, practices which the emperors sought to prohibit, but, at least in the former case, without marked success. The *patroni* counted as honorary members of the Senate. Youths under 25 could be inscribed on the roll of the Senate under the title *praetextati*. They could then attend its meetings, but could not speak or vote. Thus, on the roll at Canusium, besides the 100 decurions (arranged in order of office), are the names of 39 *patroni* and of 25 *praetextati*.

555. (3) *The 'People'*. In the towns of the West the citizens were divided into *curiae* or *tribus* for the purposes of voting at elections and in legislation. *Curiae* are found in both colonies and *municipia*. The number varied. Thus, there were 10 *curiae* at Lambaesis, 12 *tribus* at Lilybaeum, 23 *curiae* at least at Turris Libisonis, etc. In the Greek cities the old divisions into *φυλαί* lasted on, new tribes being not seldom found besides the old four Ionic and three Dorian tribe-names. Thus, Tegea had four tribes, Ephesus (c. 100 A.D.) six, Prusias at least twelve, and Athens under Hadrian thirteen.

The powers of the popular assemblies in the West were small. They elected all magistrates (each *curia* giving a single vote and the majority electing), and oaths were administered to the newly elected magistrates at *contiones* of the people. But their legislative competence seems to have been limited to a 'decorative cooperation' with the Senate in passing votes of honour to individuals. In the Greek cities they retained more power; under Marcus Aurelius, the *ecclesia* at Athens had the right of discussing its grievances. But now no business could be introduced save by a magistrate, and the practice of insisting on a timocratic qualification for membership of the popular assembly (as at Tarsus) further depressed the democratic element in the city. Practically in no part of the Roman Empire under the Principate had the 'people' any influence in the towns. They shared in their prosperity; they suffered in their decay; but to them is in no way due, either the credit for the one, or the responsibility for the other.

556. All local finance was controlled by the local Senate, the *duoviri* being its executive officers, and the *quaestores* (when such existed) keeping charge of the town-treasury. Rules for building contracts and the leasing out of land and other public property and of taxes, figure largely in the extant municipal laws. And provision was made for the annual audit of the magistrates.

Municipal  
Finance.

The receipts of the town were derived from various sources:—(1) Lands owned by the town, not only within its boundaries but also outside; thus Capua owned lands in Crete, Athens in the Aegean islands. (2) Other kinds of town-property, as the revenue from lease of fishing-rights in rivers and lakes (but the sea was always free fishing); rent for the

private use of the town's aqueducts; charges for the use of the public baths; rent for shops in public places, etc. Mines were usually appropriated by the State, and salt was a State-monopoly, to prevent private speculation playing havoc with the price of this necessity of life. (3) Tolls, harbour dues, and taxes (new taxes had to be approved by the emperor). The Palmyra tariff would do credit to a modern Italian town, save that, in happy Palmyra, '*βρωτά*' came in and went out of the town without charge. So at Zará, in Numidia, a bullock and 100 lbs. of dates paid alike a due of 5 *asses*. (4) Fines for offences against public order, damaging public property, riding or driving on the footpath, obstructing the police in the execution of their duty. A heavy-fine was inflicted on the man who became a candidate for office when not qualified, as also on a rifler of tombs (a practice apparently common in the East). (5) Fees paid by magistrates. (6) Interest on loans.

The chief sources of expenditure were:—(1) Public worship, so far as temple revenues (which were very considerable) did not suffice, or sacrifices, etc., were not charged on individual magistrates. (2) Building and maintenance of town buildings, aqueducts, markets, baths, the city-walls, local roads (the main trunk-roads being maintained by the State), town-halls, law-courts, sewers, etc. Antioch even went so far as to light its streets, a luxury in which Rome herself did not indulge. The efforts of the ancient town to secure a pure and abundant water-supply have left traces in the aqueducts all over the Empire, some of which (as at Rome and Puteoli) are in use to this day. No expenditure was grudged for such an object. (3) State-demands, as contributions to the maintenance of the imperial-post, the land-tax, entertainment for provincial governors or emperors on visiting the town, and heavy requisitions under the Republic were made on the stipendiary towns for the support of the governor and his staff, or of troops quartered upon them. (4) Amusements. Every town had its shows, games, and festivals; and the theatres, gymnasia, amphitheatres, etc., were at least partly paid for by the towns. (5) Gifts, such as the erection of statues in honour of individuals, or burial at the town's expense. Every market-place was full of such statues, of distinguished townsmen, even of priestesses, boys, and (of course) emperors, although the expense incurred by the town might be greatly diminished in various ways, as when the recipients of the honour paid for the statues themselves, or when new heads were put on old shoulders. Miltiades and Themistocles endured this indignity at Athens. This, however, was not an expedient practice in the case of a reigning emperor. (6) Miscellaneous, as the expense of public embassies, public prosecutions, salaries of minor officials—as the *δωγμῆται* or police 'bull-dogs', clerks, etc.

In general, however, far less of a burden had to be borne by the ancient citizen than by the modern ratepayer. This was due partly to the abundant generosity lavished by the rich on their local town, in which, as in Rome herself, 'the obligation of wealth to supply luxuries for the



poor was recognised with the utmost frankness<sup>1</sup>. Baths, theatres, games, aqueducts, professors, school-teachers, were presented without hesitation. If a new sewer was wanted, the mayor was proud to provide it at his own charges, getting in return a prettily worded, though brief, inscription of thanks. Pliny's lavish generosity to his native town of Comum is one of many examples. In his life-time he gave it a library, one-third of the cost of a professor of rhetoric, and a large sum to be devoted to the education of freeborn children; and by his will he made ample provision for baths, pensions, and feasts. Imperial gifts were also common, and hardly an emperor failed to come to the rescue of towns in distress. Again, many modern sources of increased rates did not then exist. All the higher offices were unpaid. There was neither poor-rate nor education-rate. There is no evidence that any town paid for a school for its children. Education was a matter either of private enterprise or of private generosity, such generosity as once built and endowed our own Colleges. Some towns had libraries, presumably 'free', but these again were private benefactions. The most that the central government would do was to relieve a limited number of physicians, philosophers, and grammarians from some of the *munera* of the ordinary citizen, or occasionally bear the cost of one or two teachers.

Finally, the town imperatively demanded of its citizens the gratuitous discharge of many duties, attaching partly to a man's person (*munera personarum*) partly to his property (*munera patrimonii*), for which the town itself would have to pay at the present time. The spirit of the old City-State lived on in the municipalities of the Roman Empire, and the 'State' could make demands on its members' loyal service and affection, which would not be tolerated now.

557. In all matters of public policy the local town was entirely subject to the wishes of the central government. In jurisdiction, under the Republic, the local magistrates of Roman towns in Italy (*coloniae* and *municipia*) decided civil suits unless the sum involved exceeded 15,000 sesterces (which then were heard by the Roman praetor), and criminal cases, save those which the *Leges iudiciorum publicorum* reserved for trial by a *Quaestio* at Rome. The jurisdiction in the *praefectura* rested with the Roman *Praefectus*. Such few Roman towns as existed in the provinces seem to have been exempt from any control or jurisdiction by the Roman governor. In the stipendiary towns, on the other hand, all higher jurisdiction rested with the governor, who tried every case where a Roman *civis* was concerned, and might try any other case he pleased, nor, unless the *caput* of a *civis* was involved, could any appeal be lodged against his decision. In the free towns, a governor who, without special permission, interfered with the local tribunals was deemed to be exceeding his powers. But a town could invite the governor to establish his *conuentus* in it, thereby voluntarily

The Control  
by the Central  
Government.

<sup>1</sup> A. H. Greenidge, *History of Rome*, p. 26.

sacrificing part of its autonomy to the material advantages of becoming a provincial centre of administration. Under the Empire, at least in all Roman and stipendiary towns, it was possible to appeal from the sentence of the local magistrate or governor to the *maius imperium* of the Princeps or his delegate, and the local jurisdiction even of first instance became more and more limited. Under the Republic, the greed of Roman governors, such as Piso and Verres, had illegally ventured to interfere even with the financial administration of the free towns. The financial organisation of Augustus substituted order for chaos through the Empire. But, by the 2nd century A.D., many self-governing towns had used their autonomy to plunge into debt, and stringent measures on the part of the central government were needed. Special commissioners, *correctores*, were despatched (the first by Trajan to Achaëa) 'ad ordinandum statum liberarum civitatum', and already, under Nerva, the first Imperial *curator* had been appointed to examine and control local accounts. Interference by the central with the local government having thus been initiated, the system rapidly developed until 'Liberty', in Pliny's words, became a 'shadow'. Presently the *curatores* became permanent officials for the control of local finance, and in 218 A.D. the first *corrector* even for Italian municipalities was appointed. Such encroachments on local autonomy were in the interests of the towns themselves, and no more to be regretted than the presence of the imperial Podestà in Italian cities in the 13th century, or the careful financial control exercised by our own Local Government Board. Even the Roman enthusiasm for local self-government and independence was prepared to give way in favour of central control, when that independence was misused and the local government became careless, extravagant, or venal.

558. It has already been suggested that the beginning of the municipal system with the creation of the first *municipium* (if not with the despatch of the first colony) set Rome upon a path of development which led to Empire, and shaped all the future course of history. But, throughout the Republican period, men in the local towns tended either to be hostile to Rome, regretting their town's former independence, or to be eager for political advancement rather in Rome itself than in their own native city. When, however, from the days of Augustus onwards, the old importance of the Roman magistrates steadily diminished, and the provincials found themselves the objects of anxious care on the part of the imperial government, local institutions received a stimulus which could not fail to have a marked effect. No longer discontented, the provincial citizen looked for honours in his local town rather than in the capital, and learnt to apply there the lessons of self-government which are the lasting gift to the world of the City-State founded on the Roman model. The ruined walls of Pompeii speak of the interest excited by, and the keen competition in, local elections. The very freedmen had new honours created for them by

Results of the  
Municipal  
System.

membership of the order of *Augustales* or *seuiri* in the local town. The wiser emperors, like Trajan, were always chary of interference with local privileges, unless such interference was forced upon them by local misgovernment. Men's political interests, which, if suppressed, were bound to lead to discontent and revolution, found as many new channels for expression as there were local towns with local constitutions. And, in return, men displayed an affection for their city, and a pride in the work of its administration, which are without a parallel to-day. Nor could this local patriotism impede, on the contrary it encouraged, their devotion to the larger unit, the Empire. The relation of the *municipium* to the State may in this be compared to that of the College to the University, when in both cases the affection inspired by the smaller community only stimulates and enforces the feeling of loyalty and pride awakened by the larger. The municipal system was the breath of life to the Roman body politic.

559. A *Collegium* (also *corpus*, *sodalitium*, *συνεργασία*, *συντεχνία*, etc.) was an association of at least three persons united for a common object under a law of the association binding on the members, who thus formed a society with a definite organisation and legal personality. In Rome, down to 64 B.C., there were no restrictions on the right of association, the Senate only interfering in the event of an abuse of the privilege, and acting sharply and sternly, when it suspected the existence within an association of secret political plotting (as in the suppression of the *Bacchanalia* in 186 B.C.). But, in the political struggles following the supremacy of Sulla, politicians used 'the clubs' for their own (often turbulent) objects, and in 64 B.C. many of them were suppressed by the Senate. They were permitted again by the *Lex Clodia* of 58 B.C., only to be again prohibited by a *Senatus Consultum* of 56 B.C., and the *Lex Licinia* of 55 B.C.; Julius Caesar extended the prohibition to all clubs, whether political or secular or religious, exempting only the Jewish associations for worship. It was, however, Augustus who, by a *Lex Julia* of A.D. 7, clearly laid down the law of associations which governed the clubs thenceforward. By this every club or guild was required to obtain the sanction of either Senate or Princeps, on the ground that it served some definite public utility. Under Nero, we find these regulations in force also in the Italian towns, and under Trajan in the provincial. Thenceforward, every individual club had to obtain special sanction. One exception only was made in favour of the class of clubs known as *Collegia tenuiorum* or *funeraticia*, 'Burial Societies'. Any such society might be formed without special leave, but its members were bound by law to meet only once a month, and no man might belong to more than one such society.

560. Clubs, which had not obtained such a licence, or had obtained it under false pretences, were *Collegia illicita*, and liable to be suppressed at any moment. The government, however, seems to have intentionally closed its eyes to their existence, for very many, it seems, did exist. Even when

the fiat for suppression was issued, only the founder of the club was severely punished, if he could be discovered. The ordinary members were allowed to divide the club's possessions between them and go on their way unharmed. During the 1st century of the Principate, the emperors looked with some suspicion upon proposals for new societies. Thus, after a severe fire at Nicomedia in Bithynia, Trajan would allow his special envoy Pliny to provide any number of fire-buckets for future use, but rejected his proposal to form a guild of firemen, lest, despite the safeguards proposed, it should be used for political purposes. And to some extent it was this same dislike of secret associations which caused Trajan's suspicion of the Christians in Bithynia. As time went on, it became clear that the artisans' unions had no intention of concerning themselves with high politics. No section of the community was more loyal to the Empire than the trade-unions. Even the keen interest taken by such unions in local elections at Pompeii seems a departure from their customary practice. Hence, in the second century, imperial patronage was extended to the clubs, which increased rapidly in number. Down to Cicero's day, only a few industrial *Collegia* (other than those for religious worship) existed, and the number known to have existed under the Republic scarcely exceeds 20. But, from Augustus' time onwards, the names are preserved of more than 130 of this class in Rome and Ostia alone, and of several hundreds scattered throughout the towns of Italy and the provinces.

561. Apart from associations formed for the cult of some deity or for mere purposes of pleasure (such as the *Collegium* of *seribiti*, *dormientes*, or ball-players, at Pompeii), the *Collegia* fall into three main classes: (1) Military, (2) Industrial, (3) purely 'Funeral'. The main motive for the formation of all three was to secure an honourable sepulture for the members with due commemoration after death, and the third class, the *Collegia tenuiorum*, had no other motive. Of all three it is well said of the members, that 'united in life in acts of a common worship they, like the *gentiles*, formed as it were a great family and desired to sleep their eternal sleep together as the members of a *gens* or family'.<sup>1</sup> So the *Collegium* would provide a common tomb for its members and celebrate the *Parentalia*, the 'day of the violet' and the 'day of the rose'; adjourning not seldom after such due commemorations to a common feast, whence, by express rule, all gloomy thoughts were banished, while fraternal festivities, at which any misconduct or quarrelling was punished by a fine, ended the day.

562. The military societies had the further object of promoting the professional interests of their members by grants, if necessary, from the common chest. The soldier of the line was not allowed to form such *Collegia*, the privilege being reserved to subordinate and 'non-commissioned' officers, such as quartermasters and trumpeters.

563. Of chief interest are the Artisan-Guilds or Industrial Societies.

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Waltzing, *Corporations Professionnelles*, i 267, and in Ruggiero, ii 362.



In every city artisans and tradesmen of every kind joined themselves together into guilds. Thus there existed unions of goldsmiths, blacksmiths, silversmiths, painters, bakers, pork-butchers, muleteers, merchants, sailors, greengrocers, firemen, huntsmen (these last are found scattered through the Empire from Corinth to the Roman Wall in Britain), and others in endless variety. The numbers forming a guild were often small, the largest known being one of 1320 members at Rome, and another of 1200 at Milan. Their activity seems to have confined itself to narrow limits. They represented a trade-interest; thus, they would petition for concessions to the trade, as in the matter of taxation. But there is no evidence that any trade-union in the Empire ever attempted to regulate prices or wages or hours of labour, ever sought to establish a trade-monopoly, or instituted a system of instruction for apprentices. Only two cases of strikes are known in the whole of the Roman Empire. Neither was there ever any pay from union-funds for the sick, or the poor, or for the maintenance of widows and children. It is true that, at the recurrent feasts, which were many, money was not seldom distributed (often the result of gifts or legacies), but the richer members seem to have secured a larger share than the poorer, though doubtless the latter benefited more in proportion. The funds of the union were spent (apart from the main 'funeral' objects already explained) on the common worship, on guild feasts, public rejoicings, setting up statues, and similar objects. These societies were in fact only 'Friendly Societies', in the sense of associations for the purpose of cultivating friendliness and common good-will among the members, with the three features of a common cult, common meetings, and a common sepulchre. If there existed a 'Problem of Poverty' in the Roman Empire, the *Collegia* played no part as a cause, nor did they attempt its solution.

In organisation they were democratic. Each framed its own code of rules, the *Lex Collegii*, binding on its members. The meetings were presided over by a master, elected annually. Members paid an entrance fee and monthly subscription. Rarely slaves were admitted as members, but up to their capture by the State in the 4th century the industrial unions refused membership to women. One solitary example, however, has been found of a women's guild—the *sociae mimae* (*C. I. L.* vi 10109).

Evidence for the municipal system is mainly epigraphic. The chief inscriptions, arranged chronologically, are (1) *Epistula ad Heracleotas* (found in 1843) for Heraclea in Caria, B.C. 188 (*C. I. G.* 3800). (2) *Senatus consulta de Thisbaeis* (found in 1871) for Thisbe in Boeotia, B.C. 170 (*Ephemeris Epigraphica*, i 278—298). (3) *Lex Antonia de Termessensibus* (found xvth century) for Termessus in Pisidia, B.C. 71 (cf. *C. I. L.* i 204). (4) *Lex Municipii Tarentini* (found 1896) for Tarentum in S. Italy, 1st century B.C. (*Eph. Epig.* ix 1 sqq.). (5) *Lex Rubria* (found 1760) and *Fragmentum Atestinum* (found 1880) for Cisalpine Gaul, B.C. 49 (*C. I. L.* i 205 and Savigny *Vermischte Schriften*, iii 377—400). (6) *Lex Iulia Municipalis* (Tabulae Heracleenses)

Bibliography.

(found 1732—1735), for Rome and other Roman towns, B.C. 45 (*C. I. L.* i 206, and Savigny, *op. cit.* iii 279—412). (7) *Senatus consultum de Aphrodisiensibus* (published 1738) for Aphrodisias in Caria, B.C. 44 (*C. I. G.* ii 2737). (8) *Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* or *Lex Ursonensis* (found 1870—1875) for Urso in Baetica, B.C. 44 (*Eph. Epig.* ii 105—148; iii 87—112). (9) *Lex Salpensana*, and (10) *Lex Malacitana* (found 1851) for Salpensa and Malaga in Baetica, A.D. 82—84 (*C. I. L.* ii 1963, and Zumpt, *Studia Romana*, 267—322). (11) *Album Canusinum* (found 1675) for Canusium in Apulia, A.D. 223 (*C. I. L.* ix 338). (12) *Album ordinis Thamugadensis* (found 1876) for Thamugadi (Timgad) in Numidia, A.D. 360—364 (*C. I. L.* viii (1) 2403, or *Eph. Epig.* iii 77—84).

Most of these can be found in Bruns, *Fontes Iuris Romani*, 6th edition, or in Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, vol. ii, cap. 14, pp. 482—736, which also contains a great number of the shorter inscriptions bearing on the subject.

Modern works: Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, i (or in the French Translation, *Organisation de l'Empire romain*, i); Beloch, *Der Italische Bund unter Roms Hegemonie*; Liebenam, *Städteverwaltung im Römischen Kaiserreiche*; Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, ii (or in the French Translation, *Droit public Romain*, vi (2)); J. P. Waltzing's *Étude historique sur les Corporations professionnelles chez les Romains*, 4 vols., Louvain, 1895—1906; and his articles in Ruggiero, *Dizionario Epigrafico di Antichità Romane*, on *Collegium* (ii 340—406) and *Colonia* (ii 415—457); W. T. Arnold, *Roman Provincial Administration*, chapter vi (somewhat antiquated). A brief summary in Greenidge, *Roman Public Life* (chap. viii and xi); and Willems, *Droit public romain*, pp. 350—363 and 499—523. Mommsen's chief articles on the subject and on the inscriptions concerning it are conveniently reprinted in his *Gesammelte Schriften* (*Juristische*, Band I), Berlin, 1905.

## VI. 8. COLONIES.

564. FROM the very first, the primary object of Roman colonisation was military defence and security; and for many years this object remained prominent. While the Greeks were prompted to send out colonies by many causes, such as superabundance of population, the instinct of exploration and love of travel, trade interests and commercial activity, or intestine disputes between factions at home, of these only the last two, and that in a small degree, produced the colonies founded by the Romans. Thus in the early days of the Republic there were times when the poor clamoured for a share in the lands owned by the State (which the rich always tended to appropriate to themselves), and when the rich were bitterly opposed to such claims. Whereupon the government sought to allay the quarrel by allotting unappropriated State-land, and thus prompting the malcontents to set forth and found a colony upon it. Such was the origin of the colony of Antium in B.C. 338. But, for the most part, the sole reason for the founding of a colony from the days of the kings down to those of the Gracchi was a military one. Cicero sums it up in a sentence: 'Est operae pretium diligentiam maiorum recordari,

Their military character.

qui colonias sic idoneis in locis contra suspicionem periculi collocarunt, ut esse non oppida Italiae sed propugnacula imperii uiderentur' (*De Leg. Agr.* ii 73). When Rome conquered a city or tribe in Italy, she usually appropriated one-third of its land. Such part of this land as was not then at once sold outright to individuals for the benefit of the State treasury remained public land of the Roman people (*Ager publicus*). But, as early Rome for centuries had no standing army, it was often expedient to keep a watch over the newly conquered enemy by planting a garrison in the heart of his territory. For this purpose part of the *Ager publicus* was often set aside by the State that colonists might be sent out to it from the city and should found upon it a new city-community, owning this portion of land (which the State absolutely once and for all surrendered to them), as their private property. For four centuries Roman colonisation had its root almost entirely in the military exigencies of the State. And thus, when these grew less imperative with Rome's rapid advance in power and prestige, colonisation languished until, as will shortly be seen, new motives inducing it came into play at the end of the second century B.C.

565. The word *colonus* originally meant the cultivator of the soil, 'qui terram colit'; and a *colonia* was the piece of land cultivated by him. Traces of this meaning of both words survive, especially in inscriptions. But *colonia* speedily came to mean the portion of land set apart for a definite type of *colonus*, and so, by an extension of meaning, the whole community of such *coloni* in one particular place, who were sent there by the State, 'in locum certum aedificiis munitum', to constitute there, as a definite number of families, a new city-community with a constitution and rules of its own, which rules were laid down by a definite charter of foundation. This charter, the *Lex Coloniae*, was a law passed by the State before the families were sent out, and in each case State-officials were appointed to see that it was duly executed. A colony thus differs from the other great type of towns in Italy, viz. the *municipium*, in that it is a new city-community definitely sent out from and by Rome, and *not* an existing city-community which is incorporated into the Roman State. The *differentia* of a colony as one of several types of town in the Roman system is (until the days of the Empire) its origin from Rome. (See 'Municipal System', § 543.)

Meaning of  
*colonia*.

Certain characteristics therefore of Roman colonisation are marked. (1) It is always a State-act, and implies a law of the State. Colonies founded on the initiative of private individuals, without State-sanction, are unknown to Roman public law, with the solitary exception of Cirta in Numidia, which was founded at a time of civil war by P. Sittius in 46 B.C. (2) It always involves the grant of State land, distributed by State-officials. For many centuries no private land is ever acquired by any means (fair or foul) for bestowal upon the colonists. (3) It always issues in the founding of a new city-community with a precise organisation modelled on that of Rome herself, and with political rights defined by the

charter of foundation. Very often, however, a colony is sent to an already existing town. It was seldom that by colonisation an entirely new city sprang up in the wilderness. This led to complications with the inhabitants of the already existing town, who usually, however, in the case of a 'Roman' colony, received a grant of limited citizenship at the same time. But the colony is always a city-community complete in itself, irrespective of these. And (4) it never takes the form of a general invitation to colonise, but is the sending of a precise number of settlers' families, definitely chosen and determined beforehand.

566. For many years the Roman State sent out colonies to different parts of Italy only. Transmarine colonisation was very unpopular with government and people alike. The true Roman had two instinctive characteristics, a hunger for land, and a passion for home. In course of time all Italy could be regarded as the home-land (though it was somewhat a doubtful home-land north of the Po). But it needed very strong inducements to tempt a native of Italy to make his permanent home outside the peninsula. Accordingly, down to 123 B.C., instances of transmarine colonisation (in the strict Roman sense of the term) are very rare. Scipio's 'colony' for his veterans at Italica (B.C. 207), Carteia in Baetica, the first transmarine Latin colony (B.C. 171), and Valentia in Spain (B.C. 138), are the few instances which can be quoted. We need not discuss the still rarer instances of *Coloniae Peregrinorum*, i.e. cases in which Rome sent aliens (*peregrini*), to found a colony, as at Agrigentum in Sicily (B.C. 300) and (possibly) two colonies sent by Julius Caesar to Africa. It may then, on the whole, be said that Rome sends colonies to Italy only. These colonies fall into two sharply contrasted classes:—(A) *Coloniae civium Romanorum*, and (B) *Coloniae Latinae*.

567. The *Coloniae civium Romanorum* were composed (as the name implies) of Roman citizens and their families. The original settlers sent out from Rome retained their Roman citizenship in their new homes, and thus held the land bestowed upon them in full Roman ownership, e.g. it was guaranteed by Roman law, 'ex optimo iure Quiritium'; and, as was almost always the rule with the Roman *ager privatus*, this land was exempt from taxation by the State. The colonists and their descendants possessed the full privileges of Roman citizenship, public and private, and were duly enrolled in one or other of the Roman 'tribes'. Hence, if they happened to be at Rome, they could vote at elections or upon legislative proposals, though personal attendance in the city was, as always, necessary for the purpose. These colonists had moreover at first one privilege, that of exemption from military service in the legions. For, in fact, they had been sent out to do military service, in case of need, elsewhere. And their population was so small that the absence of these citizens made very little difference to the strength of the Roman army.

Kinds of  
colonies,  
down to  
123 B.C.

(A) *Coloniae  
Civium  
Romanorum*.



The earliest of such colonies never numbered more than 300 families. They were founded on the sea-coast, to protect this against descents by pirates or foes. Hence their title at first of 'Maritime Colonies'. The earliest example was the first of all Rome's colonies, Ostia, founded traditionally by King Ancus Martius to guard the Tiber-mouth. The little city 15 miles up-stream was bound to have its passage to the open sea made secure, and the discovery of this need would not be left to a Republican government. The last of such colonies was Eporedia (Ivrea), founded in B.C. 100, in the sub-Alpine district guarding the issue of the Great St Bernard Pass. In all, there were at least 33 (some say 35) of such colonies, of which about two-thirds were on the Italian coast. Antium (B.C. 338) and Tarracina (B.C. 329) on the Mediterranean coast; Sena Gallica (B.C. 283) and Pisaurum (B.C. 184) on the Adriatic; Parma (B.C. 183) and Mutina (B.C. 183) in the valley of the Po, may serve as examples. These later inland colonies were, however, much larger in numbers, counting 2000 or 3000 families (indeed the Gauls would have made short work of a mere 300), and their colonists were not free from service in the legions.

568. The *Coloniae Latinae* (though the name does not suggest it) were composed, partly at least, of Roman citizens, who had surrendered their citizenship for purposes of the colonisation. (B) *Coloniae Latinae*. This needs explanation.

Early in the fifth century B.C., the ties of kinship and the military needs of the young Republic threw Rome into close relations with the other cities of the Latin Federal League. As Romans and Latins fought side by side in the field against their enemies, so the spoils of victory were necessarily shared between them. By the Foedus Cassianum of B.C. 493, when a colony was sent out to take possession of part of the land of the conquered, it was composed half of Romans and half of Latins, and the city thus founded was a 'Latin Colony', *i.e.* a colony, whose citizens were not only Latins in blood, but also possessed the independence and all the privileges in relation to Rome summed up under the title of the *Ius Latinum vetus* (cp. § 415). The first seven Latin colonies which, once founded, continued to exist, were truly 'Federal' colonies, namely Signia (B.C. 495<sup>1</sup>), Norba (492), Ardea (442), Circeii (393), Nepete (383), Sutrium (383), and Setia (382). Then came a change. Jealousy on the one side, pride on the other, provoked the great Latin War between Rome and her kinsfolk, and, by its end in 338 B.C., Rome stood forth undisputed mistress of Latium. After this date Latin colonies continue to be sent out, but the Latins have no claim to any share in them. Yet the old title is preserved, because the colonists, who came from Rome, surrendered their Roman citizenship, and their new colonial home was a city of 'Latins'

<sup>1</sup> The discrepancy of two years between its founding and the Foedus Cassianum need not here be discussed.

in the sense that henceforth its citizens possessed the *Ius Latinum uetus*, and *not* the rights belonging to a Roman *civis*.

For this surrender of citizen rights there were good reasons. These Latin colonies were much larger than the Roman colonies, and for the most part were more remote from Rome. To Rome herself the surrender was an advantage, as 'Latins' served in separate detachments in the army, not in the legions. Had these far-off colonists remained citizens, the levy of the legionary army would have cost time (so valuable in military operations), and the efficiency of a legion, whose men were drawn from distant places, would have been impaired. But the surrender was also an advantage to the colonists themselves. For, so far as their internal government and constitution were concerned, they enjoyed, as a Latin city, a complete autonomy, and an entire independence of the Roman government. Their land was untaxed. Their laws were their own. Yet they had a perfect reciprocity of private rights with the citizens of Rome, and they further enjoyed peculiar facilities of obtaining the Roman franchise, should they desire it. Therefore the colonists gladly surrendered their citizenship at a time when the *Ius Latinum* secured its possessors these advantages. Also by this surrender those who were not Roman citizens were more easily incorporated into the new colony, both at first, and also afterwards, when Rome began to be unwilling to bestow her franchise widely. For membership of such a Latin colony did not carry with it the grant of the Roman citizenship.

Of such non-federal Latin colonies fifteen were founded between B.C. 338—270, Cales (334 B.C.) being the first, and Paestum (273) the last of the fifteen. One of these, Venusia (291), numbered as many as 20,000 colonists.

Finally, as Rome grew in power, she began to suspect that the autonomy and privileges of these Latin cities might be dangerous to her own interests. The last twelve Latin colonies therefore which were founded in Italy, from Ariminum (B.C. 268) to Aquileia (181), enjoyed fewer rights, known as the *Ius duodecim coloniarum*, the *Ius Latinum nouum* of the jurists (cp. § 341)<sup>1</sup>. Rome believed that the time had come when she could afford to be ungenerous. Yet the Latin colonists were in large measure Roman in descent. This explains Rome's salvation in the Hannibalic invasion, when, for long terrible years, they stood loyally by her; and it equally casts discredit on the selfish policy of her later statesmen. But all distinctions of rights vanished when the whole of Italy received the full Roman citizenship (by 49 B.C.). All colonies in Italy then became *Coloniae civium Romanorum*.

569. After 200 B.C., with the final disappearance from Italy of any

From 123 B.C. danger from attack (save in the extreme North), coloni-  
to the Empire. sation, never very popular, languished, until revived by

<sup>1</sup> Beloch, *Der ital. Bund*, takes a different view. The question depends on that of the status of the city of Luca, but it need not here be discussed.

a co-operation of three causes: (1) Social, (2) Military, (3) Commercial.

570. (1) The pressure of poverty in Rome caused Gaius Gracchus to carry in 123 B.C. his measure for State-assisted emigration of the 'better classes of the urban proletariat', *i.e.* the lower middle class. By it he sent colonists to Neptunia (Tarentum) and Minervium (?) (Scylacium) in south Italy, and also (a remarkable departure from custom) to Junonia on the site of Carthage. Transmarine colonisation begins at last to be a reality, although Junonia is temporarily a failure. Subsequently, the relief of still poorer classes dictated similar colonial schemes, as those of the elder Drusus, Marius, and Julius Caesar. Caesar, indeed, had planned a gigantic scheme of transmarine colonisation, which was cut short by his death. But Urso in Baetica, which has given us one of the few surviving fragments of 'Municipal Laws', and several other colonies over seas, owed their origin to him.

Causes of  
colonisation.

571. (2) The institution of a standing army and of a long-service system, due to Marius, at once raised the question of provision for the veterans after service. Each great military commander found it necessary to find lands for his men, and this new kind of 'military need' was the cause of most of the later colonies. Eporedia (B.C. 100) was the first example of such a 'military colony'. Hence came the breach of the old rule that only State-land could be given for colonies. This was now well-nigh exhausted in Italy, and private land had therefore to be acquired for the purpose, sometimes by purchase, too often by sheer confiscation and robbery. Such were the colonies of Sulla, Caesar, and the Triumviri of B.C. 43, who had to provide for 170,000 veterans after the battle of Philippi. These military colonies, however, were sent to already existing towns, often in an attempt to re-invigorate such as were in process of decay.

It was this form mainly which colonisation took in the early Principate, at least in Italy. Augustus, in his two 'settlements of colonies' (B.C. 30 and 14), founded 28 in Italy (*e.g.* Beneventum, Ariminum, Parma, Bononia). This led to much transmarine colonisation, as the evicted inhabitants of such towns were sent to colonise Dyrrhachium and Philippi. But many of his veterans were similarly despatched overseas to Africa, Spain, Asia, Syria, and other provinces. Such new colonies in the provinces served not only as a means of provision for veterans but once again, as the colonies of the young Republic of former days, as 'propugnacula Imperii'. Whole legions could be sent to found them, as in the case of Sarmizegetusa (under Trajan), and Patrae (under Augustus). Thus, while Claudius' colonies of veterans at Cologne and Colchester served this military end, Nero's in Campania and at Antium recalled the object of re-peopling decaying towns in Italy. But to the last, as at the first, the colonies which really flourished were those which served the military rather than the social needs of the State. The Roman veterans proved no better farmers than did the Cromwellian soldiers in Ireland.

572. (3) Finally, as examples of colonies meant to open up the trade of a district to the Roman merchant and thus serve a commercial object, we may mention Narbo (B.C. 118), and, to some extent, the imperial colonies in the 'Danube provinces' under the Empire. But the commercial object was always secondary.

Such transmarine colonies under the Empire became 'quasi effigies paruae simulacraque populi Romani'<sup>1</sup>. (For their scheme of local government see 'Municipal System', § 553 f.) And, when founded on the frontiers or among a newly-subdued and uncivilised people, their influence in assisting the Romanisation of the barbarian was as important to the Empire as their primary garrison-duty. The Britons had very good reason for loathing the colonists of Colchester.

573. Under the Empire the term *colonia* was also used to express, not the origin (as heretofore), but only the political status, of the town so-called. In Italy the land given to the Roman colonist became his private property, irrevocable by the State. Thus he could sell his portion, and the occasional efforts made by the State to forbid this practice proved for the most part futile. But, outside of Italy, the State in general recognised no right whatever of private property in land, and colonists, like every one else, had to pay the land-tax instituted by Augustus. Rarely, however, exemption (*immunitas*) from this was granted, either by itself, or, more often, as part of the *Ius Italicum*, which gave the man who obtained it the same rights over his land as he would have had, if his land had been in Italy. Nearly 50 cases are known of towns in the provinces possessing one or other of these privileges, and of these all but two are 'colonies'. It seems then that the title not infrequently carried with it the privilege, and hence towns, not colonial in origin, eagerly prayed the emperor for permission to call themselves colonies (*e.g.* Viminacium in Moesia, Lambaesis in Numidia). In due course the very title, without calling for, or implying, either privilege, came to be regarded as more honourable than that of *municipium*, so that even towns in Italy would petition the emperor to be allowed to adopt it (*e.g.* Puteoli and Mediolanum). This, however, was a slow process, not fully consummated even by the time of Hadrian, and at any time sentimental reasons might make a town like Praeneste, under Tiberius, cling fondly to its old title of *municipium*, as this was proof of an origin entirely independent of Rome. But none the less a 'colony' under the Empire is often no true colony at all, in the original sense of the term; it is a 'colony without colonisation'.

574. All colonisation was the act of the 'Sovereign' only, *i.e.* the King under the monarchy, the People under the Republic, and the Princeps under the Empire, when neither Senate nor People had any voice in the matter (save in a single instance under Nerva).

The method of colonising.

<sup>1</sup> Gellius, *Noctes Atticae*, xvi 13.



Under the Republic, therefore, the *Lex Coloniae* was, with the sanction of the Senate, either proposed to the people by a consul, or (later) to the *Concilium plebis* by a tribune. It was necessary for the *lex* to state the place to be colonised, the quantity of State-land to be assigned, the number and qualifications of the colonists, and their mode of enrolment. It further provided for the appointment of commissioners '*coloniae deducendae*', usually three in number, who were to be elected by the people or plebs, to be the executive founders; and it prescribed to these their duties, such as that of nominating the first batch of senators and magistrates in the new colony (these officials being subsequently elected by the local community); fixing boundary stones; imposing fines for their removal. The power of the commissioners lasted one, two, three, or even five years. After 100 B.C. the consul or dictator might himself be charged with the duty of carrying out his own colonial schemes. And, under the Empire, the Princes always nominated his own delegates for the purpose.

After the passing of the law, those who were duly qualified were 'invited' to volunteer for the colony. The invitation might easily be a pressing one; since to refuse it might be punished by a fine. In case of need, a forced levy was held (as for Velitrae in B.C. 492), but in later years this was not found necessary. Free birth was not a necessity even for Roman colonies, if the citizenship had subsequently been obtained. Julius Caesar accepted '*liberti*' in large quantities. But 'bad character' was sometimes a more serious blemish than servile birth, and might lead to the rejection of an applicant; we are not told what constituted 'bad character'.

If the new home was in Italy, the band of colonists thus chosen marched to the place in military array, arranged in '*centuriæ*' of '*equites*' and '*pedites*', and under a military standard. On their arrival, auspices were duly taken and boundaries solemnly marked out by the plough, 'the founder of the colony' in all his proceedings carefully observing the acts ascribed to Romulus when he founded Rome herself. Then the land was divided. Part went to the Gods, for temples and their maintenance; part to the Commune as a whole, to provide income for the city's administration. But the greater part was divided into square lots by the surveyors, who chose for the purpose good ploughland, and, occasionally, some woodland also. Unfertile land was for obvious reasons not so divided. These lots were at first only two *iugera* apiece<sup>1</sup>, but, subsequently, some lots were as large as 100 (as in the Marian colonies in Africa). And colonists who were '*equites*' were given larger lots than the '*pedites*'. Thus at Vibo the one got 30 *iugera* apiece, the other 15; at Bononia 70 and 50 respectively. Under the Empire the size of the lot varied according to the rank of the veteran and the fertility of the soil. Then, the lands having been marked out,

<sup>1</sup> About an acre and a quarter.

the colonists cast lots to decide which particular portion of land should be owned by each. This done, they set to work to begin their new life and fulfil its many duties.

Bibliography. For modern writings on the Roman Colonies see the last paragraph of the bibliography of the Municipal System, p. 381 f.

## VI. 9. (A) THE ROMAN PROVINCIAL SYSTEM.

575. THE etymology of the word *Provincia* is doubtful, no one of the many derivations suggested being certain. Its meaning changed from time to time. At first it denoted any sphere of action of a magistrate possessing *imperium*, nor did it necessarily imply any military function, though this was usual. But officials without *imperium* could have no *provincia*. After B.C. 241, when Rome began to assume the direct administration of districts over-seas, the term was applied to (and presently came to be limited to) a magistrate's exercise of his authority in such districts, not including Italy, and with a geographical definition of his sphere of competence. So it came more and more to denote the actual district where such competence was valid, exclusive of all other authority.

Meaning of  
the term  
'Provincia'.

From the time of Gaius Gracchus the theory took shape that all 'provincial' land was the actual property of the Roman people, and that the usufruct alone was enjoyed by the inhabitants. For this privilege they were required to make payments to the real owners either in money or in kind. Hence the idea of taxation became inevitably associated with that of *provincia*. All land outside Italy which paid taxes was 'provincial'. All land which was not taxed was 'free', did not belong to the 'province', and the Roman magistrate in the land had no concern with it, or with its owners or its occupiers. The assessment of a land for taxation could constitute it a province before its system of government was arranged.

Thus, in the last two centuries B.C., a Province may be defined as a territory outside of Italy, owned by the Roman people, governed directly by a Roman magistrate, with defined geographical limits, subjected to Roman taxation.

Note however that (1) in cases where a *provincia* did not border upon some other *provincia*, or State with which Rome could enter on diplomatic relations, strict delimitation of frontiers may not be found. Thus the S. frontiers of Africa, Mauretania, Egypt, the N. frontier of Dacia, the E. of Syria, Arabia, remained indeterminate. (2) A long time may elapse before the political frontier of a province coincides with the line of military occupation, the former being many miles either (a) to the front or (b) to the rear of the latter, e.g. (a) Pannonia, (b) Germany, under Augustus. (3) Where the geographical came to prevail over the formal concept of *provincia*, 'free' districts within the provincial boundaries tended to become subject to the governor's control, by indirect and direct

means, by legitimised or illegitimate interference. (4) In practice the test of 'taxation' does not universally apply. Some 'free' towns paid taxes, 'freedom' then implying only self-administration. There were, in fact, many anomalies of status and many diversities of local privileges in one and the same province, and the Romans, disliking red-tape uniformity, strove rather to maintain than to abolish these, cheerfully risking any confusion that might result, especially as such confusion generally tended to their own advantage. (5) Finally, by the third century A.D., all inhabitants of the Roman Empire became Roman citizens, and the later Republican idea, that the chief privilege of citizenship was exemption from direct taxation, had to give place to the modern idea, that the citizen is one who exists to be taxed. Italy only preserved for a time, as a 'local' privilege, her old exemption from some forms of taxation. But, when all were, in other respects, of the same status and paid the same taxes, such invidious local privileges of the home-land could not for ever survive. *Provincia* then acquired its last meaning, viz. that of a 'clearly defined administrative district of the Roman Empire'. In this sense, like the land-tax, it was obviously applicable to Italy. Thus, to the 120 'provinces', into which the Empire was divided by Diocletian, Italy contributed twelve.

576. The motives which led Rome to annex lands outside Italy were three in number:—(1) the desire for her own security, or the military motive, *Defence*; (2) the desire for aggrandisement, or the imperial motive, *Conquest*; (3) the desire for gain, or the commercial motive, *Profit*. These motives were operative, at times independently, at times simultaneously.

Rome's  
'provincial  
policy'.

Defence was the chief, if not the sole, motive of the earliest period of Roman provincial policy. The desire for her own security against Carthage dictated Rome's annexation of Sicily (241 B.C.), Sardinia and Corsica (231 B.C.), and the two Spains (197 B.C.). It was neither craft nor sentimentalism, but this same motive, that inspired the policy of non-annexation which was steadily pursued by the Senate for the first half of the second century B.C. During this period Roman armies won great and notable victories east of the Adriatic, but the Senate allowed her allies to gather all the material fruits. This was simply a well-considered policy. The Roman never at any time in his thousand years of political life cared for other peoples' liberty in itself, however resolutely he cherished his own. If he thought such liberty coincided with his own advantage, he would acquiesce in it, or even take steps to secure it. There was no humanitarian sentiment wasted at Rome. Thus, between 197—146 B.C., Rome steadily refused to annex more provincial territory, because she found such territory to be a source of great expense and anxiety, and she judged that peace in the East could be maintained more easily by promoting and maintaining a balance of power among the many rival States in that part of the world.

Self-defence.

But, by the middle of the century, after long and patient trial, this policy had definitely shown itself inadequate to guard Rome against perpetual alarms. The failure of the earlier diplomacy partly coincided in time with, partly was the result of, an increase of wealth which demanded ever new spheres of activity, new opportunities of increase. The Roman Middle-Class merchant, and the financial Joint-Stock Company in which

most citizens had some interest<sup>1</sup>, made their appearance in politics. New wars gave them their chance. New needs at home, political and social, seemed to justify their demands. Roman provincial policy turned abruptly upside down. Non-annexation became the unpopular creed of a few. All classes, impelled some by love of conquest, some by lust for gain, made haste to appropriate, to annex, to exploit, with all the ignorance and brutality of greed. By this time, in the interests of peace, there was apparently no alternative to annexation. But the added policy of exploitation was characteristic (as in our own early factory system) of the business-man in a hurry.

577. In 146 B.C. began an age of annexation. Thus Africa was annexed, when Carthage was destroyed (146); Achaea, when Corinth was razed to the ground (146); Illyricum and Macedonia (146); Asia, richest province of them all (133); Gallia Narbonensis, as a means of filching Massiliot trade (120);

The age of  
annexation  
146 B.C.—  
14 A.D.

Gallia Cisalpina, created by Sulla solely as an administrative re-arrangement in Italy, and lasting as a province for scarcely forty years; and the provinces added by Lucullus and Pompey, viz.: Bithynia (74), Cyrene (74), Crete (67), Syria (64), and Cilicia (64), to which Cyprus was added (58). During this period the Roman Republic annexed some fifteen provinces. The problem of their government created the Civil War and destroyed the Republic. The condition of the governed justified, but did not create, the Principate of Augustus. In the interval between the Republic and the Empire, Caesar added Gaul (58—52 B.C.), which Augustus made into three provinces, and to these Tiberius added the two military districts of Upper and Lower Germany. Thus the Republic had given Rome her eastern frontier on the Euphrates, and her southern frontier towards the Desert; Caesar, part of her western frontier on the Atlantic.

Augustus added *ten* provinces, and gave to Rome her northern frontier on the Danube. These *ten* provinces were Egypt (30 B.C.); Lusitania (25 B.C.), the result of a re-adjustment of the Spanish provinces; Cyprus, re-annexed after temporary independence (27 B.C.); Galatia (25 B.C.); Pamphylia (25 B.C.); Raetia (15 B.C.); Noricum (15 B.C.); the small sub-Alpine 'Alpes Maritimae' (14 B.C.); Moesia (11 B.C. or 6 A.D.); and, finally, Pannonia (A.D. 10). (The number was subsequently brought up to *twelve* by the subdivision of this last province and of Moesia.) Augustus was truly an Empire-builder, though his motives were mainly the old sagacious motives of military necessity, security, defence. Empires have their natural frontiers, and, until these were reached, no lasting halt was possible. The way might be first pointed out by the merchant as the pioneer of Empire, but it was under the dictates of the soldier-statesman that this way was pursued to its ultimate goal.

578. At the death of Augustus the age of rapid expansion came to an end for a century. It was time for assimilation rather than for new con-

<sup>1</sup> Polybius, vi 17.



quest, and the old emperor, foreseeing this (as so much else) in his marvellous wisdom, bequeathed to his successors the famous *consilium coerendi intra terminos imperii* (Tacitus, *Ann.* i 11). This advice the Julio-Claudian and Flavian Princes for the most part followed. The work which these did for the Empire was mainly that of organisation and government, with such provincial re-adjustments, or even additions, as were required from time to time for the perfecting of the great system of frontier defence as a whole. Tiberius organised the two Germanies, and added Cappadocia (17); Caligula annexed the two Mauretaniae (40); Claudius made one great step in advance and rounded off Caesar's conquest of Gaul by the annexation of Britain (43). (Here the frontier was pushed steadily northwards, down to the days of Antoninus Pius.) Claudius also added Lycia to Pamphylia, making both of them into a single province (43); and he subsequently annexed Thrace (46) in the pursuit of peace on the Danube. Nero added the Cottian Alps and increased the already unwieldy Galatia by joining to it Pontus Polemoniacus and Armenia Minor (63). To the Flavian dynasty Rome owed the wise re-organisation of the frontiers on the Rhine and Danube, and on the Euphrates. Their only new province was Epirus, which was separated from Achaëa, probably by Vespasian.

The century  
of assimilation  
14—106 A. D.

579. At last the pure love of conquest re-asserted itself in Trajan, who added four more great provinces:—Dacia (107), Armenia Major (115), Assyria (115), Mesopotamia (115). Hadrian surrendered the last three, but Marcus Aurelius reclaimed Mesopotamia, which therefore remained a Roman province, while Armenia and Assyria were permanently lost to Rome. Finally, in the second century, the Pennine Alps were formed into a separate province, and Numidia was completely detached from Africa by Septimius Severus. These were purely re-arrangements of territory which had long since been Roman.

Annexation  
resumed  
by Trajan  
107 A.D.

In the second century A.D. the number of Roman provinces may be regarded as amounting to 43. The Empire began to contract when Aurelian (270—275) evacuated Dacia, a step scarcely compensated by his creation of two new Dacias south of the Danube. Diocletian (284—305) re-organised the entire provincial system, carving up the Empire (including Italy) into as many as 120 administrative provincial districts.

Diocletian.

580. Certain motives, which lead men to annex countries which are not their own, seem never to have swayed the Romans. Doubtless, the desire to provide land for the emigration of the proletariat caused the creation of a few new towns, while the need of provision for army veterans stimulated the growth of 'colonies' (see § 571). But Roman 'colonies' were town-settlements, founded in lands already owned by Rome, usually in towns

Absence of  
ordinary  
motives for  
annexation.

already existing. Neither of these motives ever prompted the acquisition of a new and considerable piece of territory.

Two other motives of annexation are Humanitarianism and Religion. The former would deliver men from misrule or savagery, introducing a more humane or civilised albeit alien government. The latter would enforce a purer religion, substituting a government professing its tenets for one of heterodox or pagan sympathies. Both motives are familiar enough to the history of the last four centuries, and never more familiar than to-day. Both are conspicuously absent from the record of Roman provincial policy. This, from first to last, was frankly selfish, and at least could not be denounced as hypocritical. Under the emperors, the success of this policy was remarkable; and the governed, as well as the ruling race, had the benefit. It had not been so under the Republic. It is the *use* of power which, for all time, justifies the Roman Empire.

One other striking deficiency may be noted, namely in the literary records of the Romans, so far as they survive. No great Roman writer of prose, and the greatest least of all, betrays any real consciousness of, or pride in, Rome's imperial mission to the subjects of her dominion. To the professional writers of Rome the good of the governed is a very secondary consideration. To them, distress or disaster in the provinces is but one stick the more, with which to belabour an unlucky emperor. To them, peace is but one sign the more of his indolence or cowardice. If moral virtues flourish, they will find these only by anthropological research beyond the frontiers. To them, the growth of towns, the increase of population, are but a hot-bed for the ravages of vice, and a cause of intolerable boasting on the part of the provincials. There is no Roman poet, save perhaps the greatest, no Roman historian, who gravely exults in, or deplores, the heavy imperial burden which the Roman bore. The magnificent administrative work by the Civil Services goes practically without notice by Roman literature. Only the complaints of a Cicero, the story of the iniquities of a Verres, the pressing perplexities of a Pliny, are preserved to us. Neither has modern sciolism in these matters its Roman counterpart. Instead of a confident scheme of reform for the government of Cappadocia, the product of a month's visit to the country, there is left us only the record of the sober survey of the coast of the Euxine by Arrian, the military governor of that province in the days of Hadrian. Alike for good as for evil, Roman literature is curiously silent concerning the Roman provincial system. It is in the main the vast increase in the epigraphic evidence now at our disposal which enables us to view the Roman provincial system in a truer perspective than was possible fifty years ago. Thus, an inscription in honour of Tiberius Plautius Silvanus Aelianus preserves the details of his great services as governor of Moesia in the time of Nero<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Dessau, *Inscriptiones Selectae*, no. 986.

581. The annexation of a province was followed by its organisation. In Republican days, this was arranged by a *lex prouincia*, one probably for every province, however acquired. The *lex* was founded, at least in some cases, probably in all, upon a report by a special commission of ten sent out to the new province by the Senate. All the provincial *leges* which are now known bear the name of the general whose victories led to the annexation or re-constitution of the province. They are the *lex Aemilia* for Macedonia, *Rupilia* for Sicily, *Aquillia* for Asia, *Caecilia* for Crete, *Pompeia* for Bithynia, and *Pompeia* again for Asia. It was the business of such a *lex prouincia* (1) to divide the province into judicial and administrative districts; (2) to define and regulate the status and privileges of its component parts; (3) to establish the principles and methods of taxation applicable within it; (4) to lay down rules for the conduct of trials and administration of justice, with special reference to the extent and procedure of local jurisdiction; (5) to supervise, and, if need be, create or amend the system of local government in the urban and rural districts which strictly belonged to the province. The original *lex prouincia* was capable of subsequent addition or amendment by magisterial edict or by Roman law. But, in its general scope, it enjoyed, in several cases, a remarkable longevity. Pompey's 'law for Bithynia' was still the basis of the Roman administration in that province in the days of Trajan, two centuries later.

Provincial  
organisation.  
*lex prouincia*.

Much, however, remained which the 'provincial law' did not, or could not, determine. Every governor therefore, on his appointment to, and before his arrival in, a province, issued an *edict*, which explained his proposed method of administration in financial and legal questions<sup>1</sup>. Such an edict tended to be largely traditional in character, and it was also founded on the principles of Roman law, which, moreover, the governor could declare he proposed to observe in all cases not covered by the edict. Thus, while much, perhaps too much, scope was left for individual activity and caprice, on the whole the system tended towards an increasing uniformity of administration and a wider diffusion of the principles of Roman law. It is probable that, by the second century A.D., there had come into existence one general *edictum prouinciale* applicable to all provinces. The place of the *lex prouincia* under the Empire was probably taken by Imperial instructions to the first governor of every new province, all of which were assigned to the emperor, to be administered on his behalf by his *legatus*.

582. In 27 B.C. Augustus divided the provinces into two main classes:—(1) the *public* provinces, governed as heretofore by ex-consuls and ex-praetors, as appointed by lot under senatorial supervision, and (2) the *imperial* provinces, of which the Princeps took exclusive charge, to which he sent his *legati*, chosen by

Classes of  
provinces:  
(1) public,  
(2) imperial,

<sup>1</sup> The *locus classicus* for the governor's edict is Cic. *ad Att.* vi 1, 15.

him from the ranks of ex-consuls and ex-praetors, and responsible to himself alone. The former were the older, richer, and more peaceful provinces, such as Asia, Sicily, Africa. The governors here had no legionary troops under their command, save in Africa only (down to the reign of Caligula). The latter were the newer frontier-provinces, such as Syria and the Germanies, where the presence of the legions was imperative. The division was not necessarily permanent, as the emperor always possessed, and sometimes exercised, the right of transfer of a province from one category to the other. A remedy employed for distress in a province was this transfer from senatorial to imperial control, the latter tending to greater efficiency and economy.

There was also a third class of 'minor', or *procuratorial*, provinces, also under complete imperial control, to which, however, (3) *procuratorial*. the Princeps sent procurators or prefects as governors instead of 'legates'. These were chosen by him from the Equestrian, not from the Senatorial, class. The only troops in such provinces were auxiliary and local levies. Egypt, as imperial private property, was administered under a system (4) *Egypt*. of government of its own, founded mainly on the old Ptolemaic arrangements for the subdivision and hierarchical administration of the country, on which were superimposed two new higher officials of Roman invention, the 'Prefect', and the 'Iuridicus Alexandreae', his assistant for civil jurisdiction throughout the whole land of Egypt.

583. The larger provinces were variously subdivided into administrative districts, often called *dioceses* and judicial *conventus*. In many cases these did not coincide; and both were often so arranged as to cut across divisions existing before annexation.

A zeal for urban development led the Romans, wherever possible, to make a town the centre of the administrative district. These districts were administered sometimes by legates subordinate to the governor or by those officials in imperial provinces whom the emperor appointed to assist his governor (since no delegate can appoint a delegate). A special military command under a separate officer was sometimes created in a province, which, for its civil administration, depended on the governor proper. Such was the condition of the Germanies, within the province of Gallia Belgica, down to the reign of Domitian, and of Numidia, in the province of Africa, from Caligula to Septimius Severus. The judicial *conventus* were the circuits visited by the governor-general in due order. (Sicily was unique in having two separate financial districts and two financial officers under one governor.) Thus Asia had 44 administrative *regiones*, and at least 12 *conventus*; Africa three *dioceses* under a legate apiece and one 'procuratorial' district, with perhaps a cross-division of three *conventus*; Bithynia and Pontus had eleven *dioceses* in the Pontic, and some twelve in the Bithynian half of the province; the 'tres Galliae' under Augustus had 64 administrative districts—*ciuitates*—(Aquitania 17; Lugudunensis



25; Belgica 22); Tarraconensis with one governor-general had three administrative divisions, each under a legate, and seven *conuentus*; Baetica had four *conuentus*; Lusitania three; and, in these two Spanish provinces, the governors-general had but one subordinate legate apiece to help them. There was in fact no hard and fast system of division, the Romans always preferring to adapt regulations to provinces rather than provinces to regulations.

584. Within the provincial boundaries might be also many 'free' towns, and client kingdoms. The former were chiefly abundant in the Eastern and Hellenised provinces, as Asia and Achaea, or where towns were plentiful at the time when Rome annexed the land, as in Africa. The latter were maintained by Rome in semi-civilised provinces where the nature of the populace and the local princes' familiarity with local methods of warfare made these the cheapest and most efficient means of preserving the peace, as in the mountainous parts of Cilicia and Judaea, just as the Russians in the Caucasus, and we ourselves in India, have reason to know well the great value of the 'client prince' as an effective unit of administration. Though the modern practice of a 'resident at court' seems seldom to have been tried by Rome, misgovernment by the prince usually resulted in prompt interference by the Romans. But, in course of time, both free cities and client principalities within the frontiers were absorbed into the general provincial system, a practice vigorously pursued, for example, by the Flavian emperors. Beyond the frontiers, the Roman government freely employed the dangerous but effective practice of paying 'subsides' to tribal chiefs.

Free towns  
and client  
kingdoms.

585. Though all due allowance must be made for forensic exaggeration, the evidence that the condition of the provinces under the Republican government was evil is conclusive. The long series of laws to punish extortion—the *leges de repetundis*—may show that the government was alive to the evil. But they also show that the passing of laws provided no real remedy. However the composition of the jury at Rome might vary, every Republican jury had interested and selfish motives, pecuniary or political, which disposed it to condemn the upright governor who sought the provincials' good, and to acquit the extortionate. Evidence of distress in Sicily, in Asia, in Africa, in Cilicia, in Cyprus, in Achaea, recorded in Cicero's speeches against Verres and his letters<sup>1</sup>; the complaints of the

Results of the  
provincial  
system.  
Condition of  
the provinces.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. especially Cicero's Letters from Cilicia, *Ad Attic.* v 14—21, and vi (of which v 16, 17, 21; vi 1, 2, 6 are most significant); also those to his brother Quintus, when the latter was governor of Asia (*Ad Q. frat.* i 1 and 2); to Furius Crassipes in Bithynia (*Ad Fam.* xiii 9) and to Silius in Asia (*Ad Fam.* xiii 65). The first letter to his brother is perhaps the most remarkable document of all, as showing how an ideal of good government can be founded on the most rotten of principles, and so is bound to fail; also, how the *publicani* constituted a good governor's hopeless perplexity. Cp., on this point, Livy xiv 18, 5.

disappointed Catullus (*Carm.* 10, 5—11, and 28, 1); the contrast presented by the provinces under the Empire, and perhaps in chief the career of the well-meaning Cicero himself as provincial governor, and his entire blindness to the darker aspects of his own deeds of omission and commission; all these explain and justify the bitter hatred which, according to Cicero himself, the provincials of his day felt for the Roman conqueror<sup>1</sup>.

Neither law nor any effective control by the home government nor, to any great extent, fear of consequences, had power to deter the provincial governor from walking crookedly. There existed no public opinion in favour of uprightness. Neither Roman religion nor any Roman code of morals cared for the interests of those who were not Romans. And the sole tradition of his order, so far as this matter was concerned, was for the governor to make money quickly for himself and the State. His opportunities of so doing were well-nigh limitless. He was absolute lord in his own domain, with supreme military control over all the troops in the province. His civil jurisdiction was limited only by the *lex provinciae*, by his own edict, and by provincial rights and privileges of recognised validity. If he chose to disregard these limits, there was no one in the province to say him nay. His criminal jurisdiction was subject to appeal only when he condemned Roman citizens, and then only by custom and not by law. There were laws which forbade him to accept presents, to make purchases in his province, to exact other than strictly defined official requisitions. He could turn the flank of, or mock at, these laws with good hope of impunity. Only native worth, not his own education, or the example of others, or the appeal to some familiar standard of honour, or any religious sanction, could deliver a Roman from the temptations in which such a position was certain to ensnare him.

586. Many causes contributed to a rapid improvement of provincial government and in the condition of the provinces, when the Republic gave place to the Empire. The following may be suggested :—

(1) The direct personal responsibility of most of the governors to the emperor, and his watchful supervision and efficient means of control over the whole number.

(2) The keen interest of the emperor in the peace and welfare of the provinces, an interest due to personal and financial reasons.

(3) The efficient legal machinery for trial in cases of maladministration. The emperor himself, or judges appointed by him, or the Senate under his eye, often in his very presence, tried such cases. Bribery was impossible. Financial interests had no influence.

(4) The general peace prevailing throughout the interior of the Empire, safeguarded by an efficient system of frontier-defence.

(5) The re-organisation and systematisation of the whole system of taxation, and its method of levy.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. especially Cic. *De Imp. Pomp.* 65.

(6) The fixed salary, now for the first time paid to the governor.

(7) The increasing spread of Roman citizenship among provincials.

(8) The creation of a new Imperial Civil Service, largely used for provincial government, which could start with clean traditions of honourable conduct.

(9) The rapid growth of a tradition and a standard of honour. The good government of the imperial provinces reacted by example on the senatorial, and there was a general levelling up.

(10) The careful selection of governors, direct and indirect, by the emperor (a choice dictated by their capacity and experience), and their lengthened tenure of office in the imperial provinces when they gave satisfaction.

(11) The constant employment of the same man in what now became his life work and profession, whereas, under the Republic, a man's heart was never in the work. But, under the Empire, a capable administrator was moved from province to province, his appointments increasing in prestige and importance, while his visits home, or employment under government at home, in the intervals brought him into personal contact with the emperor and prevented stagnation of mind.

(12) The greatly improved means of communication throughout the Empire, due to road-building and the imperial postal service. Provincial news went quickly and regularly to Rome.

(13) The personal example set by the emperor in remedy of distress, development of works of public utility, redress of grievances.

(14) The actual journeys of the emperors through the provinces, especially the journeys of Augustus and Hadrian, and of important members of the imperial family or household.

(15) The appointment by the emperors of special commissioners to report on, or to direct, the government of any distressed or backward province, such as the appointment of Pliny to Bithynia by Trajan.

(16) The growth of municipal institutions in provincial towns.

587. But there is one notable method of provincial government which, significantly enough, the Roman Empire did not employ:—the grant of the right of self-government. It is true that a great system of 'Provincial Councils' was now instituted, whereby, probably in every province except Egypt, and certainly in the vast majority, at least one, sometimes more than one, common council was created for the province. This council consisted of representatives from every part of the province, meeting annually in the Temple of Rome and Augustus at some chief town in the province. Its primary function was to celebrate the worship of, and games in honour of, the emperor under the presidency of the provincial priest whom it annually elected. But, these duties performed, it had also the right of deliberating on local provincial affairs, of solemnly voting provincial honours, of making representations to the governor or the emperor in the name of the province,

Provincial  
councils.

and (a most important privilege) of prosecuting a governor at Rome. Most trials for maladministration under the Empire are the result of these accusations on the part of the council, and in most cases the prosecution, now so weightily enforced, was successful. Yet in all this no real legislative or executive power was ever given to the provincial diets. It has been argued that greater trust in these respects by the central government in the representatives of the people in each province would have ensured the permanence of the Empire. The argument is totally incapable either of proof or disproof. But, so long as the Empire lasted, neither was the peace nor the good government nor the content of the provincials due to themselves. The imperial provincial system depended on a strong bureaucratic control, which in general aimed at the provincials' peace and welfare, while it was tempered by the right of petition.

588. The result was a marvellous increase of prosperity in most of the provinces, above all in Asia, Africa and Syria, whose condition under the Roman Empire emphasises by most striking contrast their comparative desolation and misery to-day.

General prosperity, except in Greece.

The remains of Roman buildings, from Arabia to Provence and Britain, tell the same story. Pliny's Bithynian letters show the province disturbed, indeed, but not unprosperous. Only the prosperity of Achaëa seemed lost under the Republic beyond recall. Despite imperial patronage, that unhappy country passed swiftly to decay. Towns became sordid and squalid villages, or perished altogether. Such crowds as could still be found, with time idle on their hands, thronged to hear itinerant preachers, or to see the gladiatorial games, Rome's fatal gift to Hellas. The mob of sightseers at the games was useless for the defence of their country, and even for the defence of themselves. 'The very boys ceased playing at soldiers'<sup>1</sup>. Degeneracy could no farther go.

589. But, save in the Greek homeland, the evidence of general and great prosperity in the provinces under the Empire admits of no denial. Then, for the first time, the Romans discovered themselves to be, not only great soldiers—that they knew already—but also sagacious and firm administrators. Five qualities are ideally necessary in those who go

Qualities necessary for governing alien races.

out from the homeland to govern alien races, to make them loyal members of the Empire, or at least to preserve the peace among them:—courage, intelligence or common-sense, justice, devotion to the work, and sympathy. The Romans of the imperial period, the only successful imperial people in antiquity, were lacking perhaps in the last, but in that alone. And their achievement in 'Romanising' by various methods the incongruous and widely diverse peoples of whom their provinces consisted, is greater than any even of their deeds in war.

The 'Romanising' of the world.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Mommsen's *Provinces of the Roman Empire*, i 269, ed. 1886.



## VI. 9. (B) ALPHABETIC LIST OF PROVINCES

(WITH DATE OF ACQUISITION, BOUNDARIES, ETC.).

590. (1) **Achaëa**. Annexed B.C. 146 after L. Mummius's expedition, and joined to the province of Macedonia (*q.v.*). Constituted in 27 B.C. by Augustus a separate senatorial province, when it included probably Thessaly, Aetolia, Acarnania, and Epirus. From A.D. 15 to A.D. 44 joined again to Macedonia, as an imperial province, and governed, at least for some time, by the legate of Moesia. Again in 44 A.D. a separate province and given back to the Senate. Declared free and independent by Nero on Nov. 28, A.D. 67, the Senate receiving Sardinia in compensation. Re-annexed by Vespasian in 74 A.D. Probably Vespasian assigned Thessaly to Macedonia, and made Epirus (including Acarnania) a separate procuratorial province. The river Achelôüs was thenceforth the boundary between Epirus and Achaëa, and the Oeta range separated Achaëa and Macedonia<sup>1</sup>.

591. (2) **Africa**. The province, annexed in 146 B.C. on the destruction of Carthage, consisted of the limited Carthaginian territory only, extending from Tabrăca to the Lesser Syrtis, and hemmed in on W. and S. by the Numidian kingdom. In the war with Jugurtha, Leptis declared for Rome, and probably all Tripolis, *z.e.* the strip between the Lesser and Greater Syrtis, was now joined to the province. After Thapsus in 46 B.C. Numidia was temporarily, as 'Nova Africa', a separate command, but in B.C. 25 it was added to Africa, which now stretched from the river Ampsaga on the W. to the frontier of Cyrene on the E. and was a senatorial province under a proconsul. In A.D. 37 the legion in the province and the entire provincial military administration were placed under the separate command of a special legate, all civil administration remaining with the proconsul. The legate's headquarters were moved from Theueste to Lambaesis by Trajan. The province was subdivided into three 'Dioceses', with Carthage, Hippo, and Cirta as chief town of each, and the procuratorial administrative district of 'Hadrumetina et Theuestina'. The desert frontier to the S., the line of effective occupation, did not extend beyond the Mons Aurasius. This dual civil and military control was probably abolished in A.D. 194 by Septimius Sœuerus who made Numidia a separate imperial province.

592. (3) The **Alpine districts** were (1) *Alpes maritimæ*, the district N. of Nice on both sides of the Var, conquered B.C. 14, and governed by a praefectus, later, after 69 A.D., by a procurator. (2) *Alpes Cottiae*, the district N. of (1), traversed by the Pass of Mont Genève, annexed by Nero and placed under a procurator. Chief town Segusio (*Susa*). (3) *Alpes Graiae et Poeninae*, comprising the Canton Valais and part of Savoy. Attached at first probably to Raetia, it became a separate procuratorial district in the second century A.D.

593. (4) **Arabia**. The strip of country lying between E. Syria and the desert, stretching from the Red Sea on the S. to the neighbourhood of Damascus on the N. Annexed by Trajan in A.D. 105 with title Arabia Petraea, as imperial province, and retained by Hadrian. It contained two important towns, Petra and Bostra.

594. (5) **Armenia maior**. Annexed definitely by Trajan in A.D. 114. Perhaps attached to Cappadocia from the first. Abandoned by Hadrian in A.D. 117—118. Though occupied again in 163 A.D., it never again became a Roman province until Justinian annexed part of it.

<sup>1</sup> Much in the above is still a subject of controversy, especially as regards the annexation of 146 B.C. and the inclusion of Thessaly in Achaëa from B.C. 27 rather than in Macedonia, the ancient authorities (especially Strabo, p. 840, and Ptol. iii 13, 7) admitting of dispute. For the control of Achaëa and Macedonia by the governor of Moesia, cp. Tac. *Ann.* i 76, 4; 80, 1; v 10, 3. On Nero's 'liberation of Hellas,' see B. W. Henderson's *Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*, pp. 389—392.

595. (6) **Asia.** The district annexed in B.C. 133, and organised in B.C. 129—126, included all Asia Minor W. of Bithynia, of Greater Phrygia, and of Lycia, *i.e.* Mysia, Lydia, and Caria with most of the islands off the coast. On the N. Mt Olympus and the Lower Rhyndacus separated it from Bithynia; on the S. Peraea and the Indus river from Lycia; on the E. was presently constituted the frontier of Galatia (*q.v.*). SW. Phrygia and the three 'Dioceses' of Cibyra, Apamea, and Synnada were added, probably in B.C. 82. These districts were temporarily attached to Cilicia from B.C. 56—50, but in Asia again after 49 B.C. Rhodes and its mainland territory were added by Vespasian. From 27 B.C. it was perhaps the principal senatorial province. It was administered by a consular proconsul with three legates under him. Ephesus was the chief seat of the provincial government.

596. (7) **Assyria.** The district N. of the Tigris, of very indeterminate boundaries. Annexed by Trajan in A.D. 114; abandoned by Hadrian in A.D. 117—118, and never re-occupied.

597. (8) **Bithynia et Pontus.** The kingdom of Bithynia, bequeathed to Rome by Nicomedes III in B.C. 74, consisted of the coast strip on the S. of the Propontis and Black Sea from the mouth of the Rhyndacus to the Sangarius. Pompey in B.C. 65 added to this the W. part of Mithridates' kingdom of Pontus, reaching from the Sangarius to the Halys. Amisus, E. of the Halys, was definitely part of the province from B.C. 33, and its easternmost town. Antoninus Pius detached from it Amisus, Sinôpē, and Abônouteichos, giving these to Galatia. To the S. the province was bounded by Asia on W., and Galatia on E. Senatorial from 27 B.C. Trajan sent Pliny there, from Sept. A.D. 111 to Jan. 113, to regulate its affairs as legate extraordinary, and from A.D. 135 it became definitely imperial, the Senate receiving Lycia-Pamphylia in exchange; but subsequently the province received proconsuls as well as legates to govern it in perplexing variety.

598. (9) **Britain.** The SE. portion was annexed in A.D. 43, and advance was rapid (1) W. and SW. to Isca, (2) NW. to Deua (*Chester*), (3) N. to Lindum (*Lincoln*) and, in the Flavian period, Eburacum (*York*). Much of Wales was occupied and pacified by the second century. The remains of the 'Wall' from Solway to Tyne, 73½ miles in length, are due (1) partly to Hadrian, who *c.* 120 A.D. constructed a 'turf' wall, to which the 'uallum', a double rampart and ditch, stands in some relation, and is probably Hadrian's work; (2) partly to Seuerus, who in A.D. 208 built a stone wall on the same line, 16 feet high and 8 feet thick, with large and small camps and watch-houses at regular intervals. The northern 'wall' from Clyde to Forth, 36½ miles long, was the work of Antoninus Pius, consisting of an earth rampart with ditch in front and road behind. This latter line was completely abandoned by A.D. 180, by which time the Romans had retired for ever south of the Cheviots. Seuerus divided the province into two in 197 A.D., viz. Upper and Lower Britain, divided perhaps by a line from the Humber to the Mersey. Honorius recalled the Roman garrison in A.D. 410 and the Romano-British civilisation began to yield slowly before the repeated attacks of the barbarians.

Ireland, and Caledonia N. of the Forth, never formed part of the Roman Empire<sup>1</sup>.

599. (10) **Cappadocia.** Annexed A.D. 17 as a procuratorial province. In A.D. 70 added to Galatia (*q.v.*), and, though temporarily separated under Domitian, again joined to Galatia in A.D. 96—98. In A.D. 99 a new Imperial province comprising (1) *Cappadocia proper* from Lake Tatta on W. to the Euphrates on the E.; (2) *Pontus Galaticus*; (3) *Pontus Polemoniacus et Cappadocicus*; (4) *Armenia Minor*. In the 2nd century Sophhēnē, E. of the Euphrates, and Gordyēnē, E. of that river and S. of the Tigris, were included in it. It also stretched round the E. and NE. shores of the Black Sea (as far as Dioscurias Sebastopolis), and thus, after Trajan, was one of the two great provinces for the defence of the Eastern frontier, Syria being the other, and Galatia ceasing so to be.

600. (11) **Cilicia.** A province with a complicated history. As constituted, pro-

<sup>1</sup> Cp. esp. Haverfield, *Appendix* to vol. ii of Mommsen's *Provinces*, 2nd ed. 1909, and the same historian's paper on *The Romanization of Roman Britain*, in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 29 Nov. 1905, vol. ii 185—217.

bably in B.C. 102, it included the E. part of Cilicia proper (*Cilicia campestris*, chief city Tarsus), *Pamphylia*, *Pisidia*, and *part of Phrygia*. W. Cilicia (*C. Trachea* or *Aspera*, the mountain district W. of Soli, as far as Pamphylia and Isauria) was conquered B.C. 78—74. *C. Campestris* (the district from the Syrian border on E., the Mons Amānus, to beyond Sōli on W.) was not under Roman rule from B.C. 83 to 66. In 64 B.C. the province was re-organised and consisted of (1) *C. campestris*; (2) *C. Trachea*; (3) *Pamphylia*; (4) *Pisidia*; (5) *Isauria*; (6) *Lycaonia*; (7) *part of Phrygia*. In B.C. 58 (8) Cyprus was added. Antony gave away the whole. In B.C. 23 all was again annexed, but (1) was added to Syria; (2) went to neighbouring princes; (3) (4) (5) (6) went to Galatia; (7) to Asia or Galatia; (8) became a separate province.

Vespasian probably reconstituted Cilicia as a separate province in A.D. 74, consisting of (2). (1) was added perhaps by Hadrian; (5) and (6) by Septimius Severus<sup>1</sup>.

601. (12) **Crete and Cyrene**. *Cyrenaica*, between Egypt on E. and Africa on W., as bequeathed to Rome by Ptolemy Apion B.C. 96, consisted of the Pentapolis of Cyrene, Barca and its port Ptolemais, Euesperides, Apollonia, and Teuchira or Arsinoë. First definitely annexed in 74 B.C. and put under a Quaestor pro praetore. The district Marmarica, between the Pentapolis and Egypt, was added in B.C. 20. The W. frontier was at Philaenorum Arae in the middle of the Greater Syrtis. The S. frontier, towards the desert, was quite undefined. **Crete**, first organised as a province in B.C. 67, may have then been joined to Cyrene. In B.C. 44 they were distinct. Augustus joined them together as one senatorial province with the title *Creta* (et) *Cyrenae*, and they remained united until Diocletian.

602. (13) **Cyprus**. Annexed B.C. 58 and made part of Cilicia (*q.v.*). Given away by Caesar and Antony, but re-annexed in B.C. 27, and a separate senatorial province from B.C. 23.

603. (14) **Dacia**. Trajan's two Dacian Wars, A.D. 101—102 and 105—106, resulted in the destruction of the native monarchy and annexation of the province.

*Boundaries*. In its widest extent, as claimed rather than as administered, Dacia was bounded on W. by the Theiss; on the E. by the Pruth; on the S. by the Danube; on the N. by a vague Carpathian mountain frontier. Hadrian divided the province into two, *Dacia Inferior*, the lowland country, corresponding to Wallachia, and *D. Superior*, the highland Transylvanian country. One legate governed the two, but each had its own procurator. The civil capital was Sarmizēgēthūsa; the legionary headquarters, Apulum (*Karlsburg*). In 168 A.D. there was a triple division of the province into *D. Pörrölisensis*, so called from Porolissum (*Nagy Banya*) on N.; *D. Apulensis* S. of this; and *D. Maluensis*, perhaps the SE. portion on the Danube. One consular legate governed the three, and under him each division had its own praetorian legate and procurator. Aurelian (A.D. 270—275) evacuated the province, retaining the name for two small districts S. of the Danube between the two Moesias, viz. *D. ripensis* on the river with Ratiaria for capital, and *D. mediterranea* to the S. with chief city Serdica (*Sofia*).

**Dalmatia**. See *Illyricum*.

604. (15) **Egypt**. Strictly never a province, but the private property of the emperor. Taken possession of in B.C. 30 and administered by a Prefect as chief governor. Its limits were Syēnē, by the First Cataract, on S.; the desert frontier of Cyrene on W.; on NE. the Collis Cāsius near Pēlusium. It included the Red Sea coast as far S. as the port of Berenīōē, in the same latitude as Syene. The country was subdivided into the three ἐπιστρατηγῆαι of Upper Egypt (*Thebais*); Middle Egypt (*Heptānōmis*); and Lower Egypt (*Delta*). Perhaps even under Augustus the S. frontier reached as far as Hierā Sykaminos (*Maharrakeh*). Trajan extended its NE. frontier to join his new province of Arabia Petraea (*q.v.*).

605. (16) **Epirus**. From B.C. 146 joined now to Macedonia, now to Achaëa (*q.v.*). Constituted (probably by Vespasian) as a separate province, including Acarnania, and

<sup>1</sup> It is possible that Cilicia was temporarily made by Nero a separate command. But, apart from Tac. *Ann.* xiii 33, 3, all the evidence points to its being part of Syria from Augustus to Vespasian.

governed by a procurator. Separated from Achaea on E. by the Achēlōūs. On the Adriatic, it extended from the Corinthian Gulf on the S. to Aulōn in Macedonia on N.

606. (17) **Galatia**. A name at one time including very many districts.

From B.C. 25, when Amyntas bequeathed his kingdom to Rome, to B.C. 7, the province consisted of (1) *Galatia proper*, i.e. the territory of the three tribes, the Trocmi to E. (chief town Tauium), the Tolistobogii to W. (chief town Pessinus), the Tectōsāges in centre (chief town Ancyrā); (2) *Lycaonia*, to S. of Galatia (chief town Icōnium); (3) *Pisidia*, W. of (2), E. of Caria, N. of Pamphylia (chief town Sagalassus); (4) *The E. part of Phrygia*, the rest belonging to Asia (*q.v.*) (chief town Antiochia ad Pisidiam); (5) *Isauria*, S. of (2), E. of (3). In 7 or 5 B.C. there were added (6) *The interior of Paphlagonia*, to N. of (1) and S. of Pontus (chief town Pompeiopolis); (7) *Pontus Galaticus*, a small district on S. of Black Sea between Amisus on W. and river Thermodon on E., and Comana and Amaseia inland. In A.D. 63 were added (8) *Pontus Polemōniācus*, the district on S. of Black Sea E. of (7) reaching as far as and probably including Trapezus on E. (chief town Neocaesarea); (9) *Armenia Minor*, the district on W. of Upper Euphrates and N. of Cappadocia (chief town Sātāla). Galba added (10) *Pamphylia*. In 70 A.D. was added (11) *Cappadocia*, S. of (9). But in 74 A.D. (10) was lost (*see* Lycia); and in 99 A.D. Trajan created a new first-class imperial frontier province Cappadocia, consisting of (7) (8) (9) and (11). To Galatia Antoninus gave Amisus, Sinope, and Abōnouteichos from Bithynia (*q.v.*). Septimius Severus detached from it (2) and (5), giving these to Cilicia (*q.v.*), after which time the province of Galatia thus comprised only (1) (3) (4) and (6) of the above districts.

The province, whatever its extent, was always imperial under the Empire. The chief seat of administration was Ancyrā.

607. (18) **Gaul**. Constituted (eventually) of four provinces, viz.:

(1) *Gallia Narbonensis*, the district bounded on the E. by the Alps from the Rhone glacier to the sea by Nice; on the S. by the Mediterranean and Eastern Pyrenees; on the W. by the Upper Garonne, the Tarn, and the Cevennes; on the N. by the Rhone from lake Geneva to Vienne. Annexed about 121 B.C. Its chief city Narbo was founded B.C. 118. From B.C. 27—22 an imperial province; after B.C. 22 senatorial.

Caesar's wars B.C. 58—50 added the rest of Gaul, as far as the Rhine. Governed at first with *Narbonensis*, as one province, after various changes it was divided from B.C. 27 into three, all imperial, provinces, viz.:

(2) *Aquitania*, the district enclosed between the Western Pyrenees, the Atlantic, the Cevennes, and the whole course of the Loire, thus consisting of a smaller southern Iberian and larger northern Celtic section. Under Trajan the former received a separate local organisation under the title of the Nouempopuli (later twelve).

(3) *Lugdunensis*, the district between Loire, Seine, and Saône. Its name was derived from Lugdunum (original form LVGV DVNVM), founded B.C. 43, which became the chief city in the whole land.

(4) *Belgica*, the largest of the Gallic provinces, bounded on the west by the Seine and Saône; on the N. by the North Sea; on the E. by the Rhine from Lake Constance to the sea. Its SE. portion included the W. of Switzerland N. of the Rhone Valley. Its centre of government was Durocortorum (*Reims*), which Augusta Trēuerorum (*Trèves* or *Trier*) soon rivalled in prosperity.

608. (19) **Germany**. From A.D. 17 Roman Germany consisted definitely of two military frontier districts on the left bank of the Rhine, viz. (1) *G. Superior*, reaching from Lake Constance to Brohl, midway between Bonn and Coblenz, (2) *G. Inferior*, from Brohl to the sea. The former reached westwards to the Vosges, the latter to the Ardennes. The chief town of (1) was Moguntiācum (*Mainz*), of (2) Colonia Agrippina (*Cologne*), a colony since A.D. 51. The two districts were purely military commands, each under a legate of consular rank who, down to the Flavian age, had four legions under his orders. For civil administration both Germanies belonged to Gallia Belgica down to the time of Domitian, and the collection of taxes was the duty of the procurator of Belgica at least to the middle of the second century A.D. Domitian made them separate provinces.

Subsequent advance beyond the Rhine was as follows:



(1) The 'Agri Decumates', viz. the district of the Neckar, annexed in A.D. 73—74. Arae Flaviae (*Rottweil*) became the centre of the new road-system.

(2) North of this the Taunus district and the valley of the lower Main, annexed in 83 A.D. A *limes*, 120 Roman miles in length, guarded by small earth forts and towers, was drawn from Kesselstadt on the Main N. to Oberflorstadt, and thence along N. slope of Taunus to the Lahn and so to the Rhine at Rheinbrohl. Under Hadrian stone forts replaced the earthen, and it was further strengthened later in the century.

(3) The Neckar and Main districts were connected under Domitian by a line of forts which ran S. from Kesselstadt up the Main to Worth, thence S. to Schlossau, and continued to the Neckar at Wimpfen; thence along the Neckar to reach the N. end of Vespasian's line at Kongen or Rottenburg. The Worth-Schlossau (the *Odenwald*) line consisted of earth forts and wooden towers; the Schlossau-Neckar section had stone forts on the actual frontier line of the river.

Hadrian erected a palisade and ran a ditch along the Neckar-Main frontier, wherever the river did not serve as a defence. Antoninus Pius advanced the frontier, drawing a straight *limes* guarded by stone towers from Miltenburg or Welzheim to Walldürn in front of Domitian's line, and moving the garrisons forward.

(4) The Raetian frontier was connected with that of the Agri Decumates under Seuerus and Caracalla by the *Limes Raetiae*, a stone wall 8 feet high running from Hienheim on the Danube above Ratisbon for 100 miles to a point NW. of Lorch. This is known as the 'Teufelsmauer'. From Lorch an earth-bank and ditch, known as the 'Pfahlgraben', erected behind the old palisade, ran along its line 200 miles to the Rhine.

The trans-Rhenane territory was finally lost under Gallienus (A.D. 253—268); the last Roman inscription here is one of A.D. 250. (Cp. esp. Pelham, *A chapter in Roman Frontier history*, ap. *Trans. of the Royal Historical Society*, N.S., Vol. xx, 1906.)

Hispania. See Spain.

609. (20) *Illyricum* or *Dalmatia*. From the time of the wars with Queen Teuta (229—228 B.C.), *Illyricum* was for many years a name loosely used for Pannonia, Moesia, Dalmatia, and parts of Macedonia.

The province of *Illyricum* dates probably from the fall of King Genthius in 167 B.C., but its definite organisation with a governor etc. was certainly later. In Cicero's day it was one of the recognised *provinciae*, and consisted of a strip of coast on the Adriatic north of the river Drin with an indefinite amount of 'Hinterland'. Octavian in 35 B.C. subdued the Dalmatian tribes from Doclea to Fiume, and added them to the province, which in 27 B.C. was allotted to the Senate. In 11 B.C. it was transferred to the imperial administration. Probably in 10 A.D. the new province of Pannonia was created, and the boundaries of *Illyricum* fixed. It thenceforward included the coast from Lissus on the S. to the Istrian promontory and Italian frontier on the NW., with Pannonia on the N. (roughly the valley of the Save), and Moesia on the E. From the Flavian period the name for the province was usually *Dalmatia* instead of *Illyricum*. The province consisted of two districts, *Liburnia* to the north of the river Kerka and *Dalmatia* proper to the S. of this. The chief seat of administration was *Sälōnae*. Diocletian made the old royal capital *Scodra* the head of a separate district.

610. (21) *Judaea*. From B.C. 63 to 40 part of the province of Syria; from B.C. 40—4 a dependent principality under Herod the Great. In B.C. 4 divided into three such principalities, viz. (1) *Judaea* with *Samaria* and *Idumaea*, under Archelaus. In A.D. 6 this became a procuratorial province till A.D. 41 (see below). (2) *Trachonitis*, *Auranitis*, *Batanea*, *Gaulonitis*, *Iturea*, under Philip the 'Tetrarch'. This in A.D. 34 was joined again to Syria. (3) *Galilee* and *Peraea*, under Herod Antipas as 'Tetrarch'. All three were reunited and given as kingdom to Herod Agrippa who acquired (2) in A.D. 37, (3) in A.D. 39, (1) in A.D. 41. Of these (2) and part of (3) were given to Herod Agrippa II in A.D. 53. But *Judaea* proper etc. (1) and part of (3) in A.D. 44 became again a procuratorial province to A.D. 70. In 70 A.D., on the fall of Jerusalem, it became a first-class imperial province under a legate, who had the Tenth Legion under

his orders. Its official title in the 2nd century was Syria Palaestina. It remained a separate province as late as the 4th century. The official capital city was Caesarea.

**611. (22) Lycia and Pamphylia.** Lycia was recognised as free by Sulla and Antony. Pamphylia was part of Cilicia in B.C. 102 and from B.C. 64; a province in B.C. 25. Lycia-Pamphylia was one province in A.D. 43, Lycia again became free under Nero or Galba. Pamphylia under Galba was part of Galatia.

The province L.-P. was definitely organised, probably in 74 A.D., as an imperial province. In A.D. 135 it was given the Senate in exchange for Bithynia.

L. extended from the river Indus on W. to Phaselis on E., and had on the N. Caria and Phrygia (parts of Asia). P. was the coast strip from Phaselis on W. to Syedra on E., and had on the N. Pisidia, on the E. Cilicia.

**612. (23) Macedonia.** After the battle of Pydna, B.C. 168, divided into four 'regiones', viz. *Amphipolis*, *Pella*, *Thessalonica*, *Pelagonia*. The whole country paid annual tribute to Rome, but otherwise the 'regiones' were free, i.e. each self-governed by an elected Council and magistrates, though inter-cantonal connubium and commercium were forbidden.

Fully annexed as a province in 146 B.C., its boundaries from 146–27 B.C. being the river Nestos on E., Adriatic on W.; on S. it included Epirus, Thessaly, and Achaea, on NW. Illyricum as far as the frontier town Lissus, and the mountain range of Scardus. In 27 B.C. Augustus separated Achaea, Epirus, Acarnania, and Aetolia from it, constituting these the province of Achaea (*q.v.*), but it always retained the strip of coast on the Adriatic from Lissus to Aulon, with Dyrrhachium and Apollonia as chief coast towns. On the NW. it was bounded by the province of Illyricum; on the N. by Moesia; on NE. by Thrace. From 27 B.C. to A.D. 15 a senatorial province. From A.D. 15 to 44 an imperial province, now again including Achaea, Epirus etc., and, for some time at least, under the administration of the governor of Moesia. In 44 A.D. again a separate senatorial province within the boundaries of B.C. 27. Probably Vespasian assigned Thessaly to Macedonia, its S. frontier thenceforward being the range of Oeta, its SW. the new province of Epirus.

**613. (24) Mauretania.** The district comprising all the NW. of Africa W. of the river Nestus on E., Adriatic on W.; on S. it included Epirus, Thessaly, and Achaea, on NW. Illyricum as far as the frontier town Lissus, and the mountain range of Scardus. In 27 B.C. Augustus separated Achaea, Epirus, Acarnania, and Aetolia from it, constituting these the province of Achaea (*q.v.*), but it always retained the strip of coast on the Adriatic from Lissus to Aulon, with Dyrrhachium and Apollonia as chief coast towns. On the NW. it was bounded by the province of Illyricum; on the N. by Moesia; on NE. by Thrace. From 27 B.C. to A.D. 15 a senatorial province. From A.D. 15 to 44 an imperial province, now again including Achaea, Epirus etc., and, for some time at least, under the administration of the governor of Moesia. In 44 A.D. again a separate senatorial province within the boundaries of B.C. 27. Probably Vespasian assigned Thessaly to Macedonia, its S. frontier thenceforward being the range of Oeta, its SW. the new province of Epirus.

**614. (25) Mesopotamia.** Annexed in A.D. 114 by Trajan, who gave back its western part, Osroënē, to a native dynasty ruling from Edessa. It reached between the Tigris and Euphrates from this district to the sea. Hadrian abandoned it, but it was re-annexed between A.D. 162 and 165. In the third century it was many times lost and reconquered, but most of it, with the stronghold Nisibis, was finally surrendered to the Parthians by Jovian in A.D. 363, 'the first instance of the forced cession of territory presented to us by Roman history' (Marquardt). Osroene remained under native dynasts save in the days of Caracalla.

**615. (26) Moesia.** The district bounded on the N. by the Danube from the Black Sea to Belgrade (Singidūnum), and thence, along the lower Save and a straight line W. to the Drina; on the W. by the Drina and Dalmatian frontier; on the S. by Macedonia and the Schar Mts and by Thrace and the Balkans; on the E. by the Black Sea from the Danube delta to the Balkans; thus comprising Servia and Bulgaria.

In 29 B.C. Crassus crossed the Balkans and reached the lower Danube, but the province was not constituted until 11 B.C. or (at latest) 6 A.D. From A.D. 15, for at least some years, the governor of Moesia exercised control over Macedonia and Achaea as well. After A.D. 44 these provinces were again distinct. Domitian between A.D. 82–86 divided Moesia into two, *Moesia Superior*, the W. portion (Servia), and *M. Inferior*, also known as 'Ripa Thraciae', the E. portion (*Bulgaria*) from the river Zibritz to the sea, each under a consular legate. The governor of Moesia exercised some supervision over the northern coast of the Black Sea, the Greek cities, the kingdom of Bosphorus, and the tribes in this region,

The legions in Moesia before 70 A.D. were stationed probably at Singidūnum (*Belgrade*) and Viminacium (*Kostolatz*) on the Danube in the W. of the province (unless one was at Naissus in the interior). Vespasian probably established camps at Ratiaria and Oescus on the Danube in the central portion of the province. Domitian established three more legionary camps on the lower Danube at Nouae, Durostorum, and Troesmis. Later a dyke was built from Tomi to the Danube at Rassova and there are traces of a dyke (possibly Roman) north of the delta from the Pruth to the sea.

616. (27) *Nōricum*. The district bounded, on the W., by Raetia and the lower course of the river Inn from Wörgl to its inflow into the Danube at Passau (*Castra Batāua*); on the N. by the Danube from Passau to a point a few miles W. of Vienna; on the S. by the Carnic Alps S. of the line of the river Drave from its source to a point a few miles W. of Poetovio; on the E. by the Pannonian frontier, marked by no natural boundary, but lying W. of a line drawn from Poetovio to Vienna; thus comprising Styria and Carinthia, with part of Carniola and most of Austria.

Probably constituted a province by Augustus in or soon after B.C. 15. It retained its old title, the *Regnum Noricum*, but was administered by a procurator, until Marcus Aurelius placed it under the legate of the Second Legion, whose headquarters were at Lorch (*Lauriacum*).

(28) *Numidia*. See Africa. *Palestine*. See Judaea. *Pamphylia*. See Lycia.

617. (29) *Pannonia* was the district lying between the valley of the Save from its source to its inflow into the Danube at Semlin on the S., the Danube from Vienna to Buda-Pesth on the N., the Danube from Buda-Pesth to Semlin on the E., and the frontier of *Nōricum* on the West, thus comprising Croatia, Slavonia, and West Hungary. The Roman military frontier reached the Save in 35 B.C. and the Drave by 10 B.C., and though, by Claudius' time, some legionaries were stationed on the Danube at Carnuntum (*Petronell*, near Vienna), it was not until the Flavian age that the main line of military establishment was moved from Poetovio and the Drave to Carnuntum and Vindobona on the Danube. Meanwhile the whole district, with the boundaries stated above, had been formed into a province separate from Illyricum (*q.v.*) probably in 10 A.D., so that for many years the true military frontier lay far in rear of the political. At the beginning of the second century A.D. the province was divided into two, *Pannonia Superior* and *P. Inferior*, and legionary headquarters existed at Brigetio, Carnuntum, and Vindobona in the former, and at Aquincum in the latter, shifted later to Acumincum at the meeting of Theiss and Danube. The upper province was by far the larger and was governed by a consular legate from the first; the lower province was at first under a praetorian legate, but under a consular at least from the days of Sept. Seuerus. No natural boundary separated the two provinces. About A.D. 215—225 Brigetio was transferred to *P. Inferior*.

*Phoenicia*. See Syria.

618. (30) *Raetia*. The district bounded on the W. by Gallia Belgica and the Pennine Alps (roughly by a line drawn from the W. end of Lake Constance to the E. end of the Lake of Geneva); on the S. by the Alps from the Lake of Geneva keeping N. of the Rhone Valley to Bruneck E. of Brixen on the Brenner; on the E. by *Nōricum* (*q.v.*); on the N. by the 'Limes Raetiae' from Upper Germany to the Danube above Ratisbon and thence by that river as far as Passau; thus comprising the valleys of the upper Danube and upper Inn, the E. part of Switzerland, with Tyrol, and Bavaria. It consisted of two districts, Raetia proper on the S. and Vindelicia on the N.

Constituted a province under a 'procurator' in or soon after 15 B.C. Marcus Aurelius placed it under the legate of the Third Legion, whose headquarters were at Ratisbon (*Regina*). Its chief town Augusta Vindélicorum (*Augsburg*) was founded under Augustus. Claudius had the road built over the Brenner Pass. For the 'Limes Raetiae', see Germany.

619. (31) *Sardinia et Corsica*. Sardinia was annexed B.C. 238; Corsica, occupied B.C. 238, and joined to Sardinia B.C. 231, the two remaining a single province until Diocletian. At first under a Praetor; from B.C. 122 a Propraetor; B.C. 27—A.D. 6 a senatorial province; A.D. 6—67 imperial. In A.D. 67 restored to the Senate by Nero

in compensation for the loss of Achaëa (*q.v.*). Vespasian took it back to imperial control under a 'procurator et praeses'.

620. (32) **Sicily.** The first of the Roman provinces, annexed B.C. 241, consisting of the west part of the island. The east part, the old kingdom of Syracuse, with its seven towns, was added in B.C. 210. From B.C. 227 governed by a praetor; from B.C. 122 by a propraetor. It was divided into two financial districts with one quaestor for each, resident, the one at Lilybaeum, the other at Syracuse. In 27 B.C. a senatorial province.

621. (33) **Spain.** Annexed B.C. 197 and divided into two provinces separated by the *Saltus Castulonensis*, viz. *Hispania Citerior*, with chief city Noua Carthago, and *Ulterior*, with chief city Corduba. The Cantabri in the NW. remained unsubdued until B.C. 19. After 25 B.C. *H. Ulterior* was subdivided into two separate provinces, viz. (1) *Baetica*, a senatorial province, reaching from Urçi on the SE. of the peninsula to the mouth of the Guadiana on the SW. This river and the Sierra Morena roughly formed its N. and NE. frontier. Its chief city was Corduba. (2) *Lusitania*, an imperial province, the district between the Guadiana and the Douro on the Atlantic seaboard. It did not include that part of Portugal lying N. of the Douro, but extended up the Tagus beyond the Portuguese frontier, and included a large part of Spanish Estremaduras. Its capital city *Ēmērita (Mērida)* lay on the Guadiana. At the same time the chief centre of administration for *H. Citerior* was moved to Tarrāco, and the province thenceforth was usually called (3) *Tarrāconensis*. This was by far the largest of the three, embracing two-thirds of the whole peninsula, viz. the whole E. portion and the NW. corner from the Bay of Biscay to the Douro. This NW. district of *Astūria et Gallaecia* was one of three subdivisions of *Tarraconensis* up to A.D. 216–217 when it became a separate province, called *Hispania noua citerior*.

622. (34) **Syria.** Annexed B.C. 64, and reached from the Gulf of Issus and Zeugma on the upper Euphrates on N., to Egyptian frontier on S., and E. to the Arabian desert, thus including Syrians, Jews, Phoenicians, Arabs, and a mass of Hellenic or Hellenised cities. Many peoples and cities within or beyond these limits were at first free and subsequently incorporated into the province, viz. (1) *Judaea*, from B.C. 63–40 (*q.v.*); (2) *Commagene* from A.D. 17 to 38 and finally in A.D. 72 (W. of Euphrates, between Cappadocia on N. and Syria on S.); (3) *Abilēnē* probably in A.D. 48–49 (a small district NW. of Damascus); (4) *Arethusa* and *Ēmēša*, probably under Domitian (a small district on the upper Orontes); (5) *Chalcis* about A.D. 92 (mainly the valley between Libanus and Antilibanus near Damascus); (6) *Damascus*, in A.D. 106; (7) *Palmyra*, in A.D. 106. By A.D. 198 the province was divided into two, viz. Syria magna or Syria Coele on N. with Antioch as capital, and Syria Phoenice, or Phoenice simply, on S., comprising Phoenicia and the districts E. of it. Laodicea temporarily took Antioch's place as metropolis under Pescennius Niger.

623. (35) **Thrace** was the district bounded on the N. by lower Moesia and the Balkans; on the E. by the Black Sea from Mesembria to the Bosphorus (Byzantium, however, probably never belonged to the province); on the S. by the Propontis and Aegean as far as the Macedonian frontier beyond Abdēra; on the W. by Macedonia and upper Moesia, roughly along the line of the Nestus and upper Strymon respectively; thus comprising Eastern Roumelia, and part of Roumelia and Turkey.

Save for the strip of coast N. of the Aegean, which, during the Roman Republic, was under the control of the governor of Macedonia, and the Thracian Chersonese, which, from the time of Augustus, was imperial private property, Thrace was under semi-dependent native princes until A.D. 46, when Claudius annexed it, and set it under a procurator. Trajan raised it to the rank of a praetorian province.

The two most important books on the Roman Provinces are Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* (especially in the French translation, *Organisation de l'Empire romain*, being vol. ix (2) of Mommsen-Marquardt, *Manuel des Antiquités romaines*), and Mommsen,



*Römische Geschichte*, Band v (translated in English as *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, 2 vols. A new and revised edition of this, published in 1909, contains as an Appendix a few valuable pages on Roman Britain by the reviser, Prof. Haverfield. Otherwise, the new edition is practically a reprint of the old). These two books deal with the particular provinces, but Marquardt adds a general sketch of the system of provincial administration. Hirschfeld, *Die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bis auf Diocletian*, ed. 2, Berlin, 1905 (514 pp.), is valuable, as also is Schiller's short sketch (founded on Marquardt), *Die römischen Staats-, Kriegs- und Privataltertümer*, pp. 646—670, being vol. iv (2) of Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, 1887. Of English writers, W. T. Arnold, *The Roman System of Provincial Administration*, new ed., revised by E. S. Shuckburgh, Oxford, 1906 (274 pp.), is most complete; but the article *Provincia* in Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, and pages 316—330, 426—440, of A. H. J. Greenidge's *Roman Public Life*, London, 1901, present succinct summaries. The system has been well described in French by P. Willems, *Le droit public Romain*, ed. 6, Louvain, 1888, pp. 366—371, 527—536, and by V. Chapot, s.v. *Provincia* in Daremberg and Saglio. C. Halgan's *Essai sur l'administration des provinces sénatoriales sous l'Empire romain*, Paris, 1898 (364 pp.), may also be consulted. The introductions to the various Provinces in the volumes of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, and the inscriptions in Dessau's *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, are invaluable. There are innumerable works and papers on particular provinces and questions connected therewith. Among those of special interest are the articles on the Provincial Concilia in Ruggiero's *Dizionario Epigrafico*, and E. G. Hardy's *Studies in Roman History*, First Series, London, 1906, pp. 236—283; the latter writer's pages 29—49 in his edition of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan; that most charming sketch of a Roman province, G. Boissier's *L'Afrique romaine*, 2nd edition, Paris, 1901; and finally every remark on the provinces in W. Warde Fowler's *Social Life at Rome in the age of Cicero*, London, 1908.

Lord Cromer's suggestive essay on *Ancient and Modern Imperialism* was published in January 1910, when the above pages were already in type.

## VI. 10. (A) INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE.

624. THE prosperity of early Rome was in part due to her position at the intersection of a land-way and a water-way—where the Tiber, the chief navigable river of the west coast, was crossed by a bridge which formed the easiest means of communication between Latium and Etruria. The ancient cattle market (the *Forum Boarium*), between the Palatine and the earliest bridge (the *Pons Sublicius*), was the beginning of a commercial quarter which eventually extended past the Aventine for more than a mile along the river-bank. Not only the Tiber but several of its tributaries are navigable; they carried to Rome the produce of eastern Etruria, Umbria and the Sabine mountains, to be exchanged for salt from the salt-pans at the river mouth. The name of the *Via Salaria*, which ran north-east from Rome to Reate and Asculum in

The regal and early Republican period.

Picenum, preserved the memory of this early traffic. Other staple commodities were corn, slaves, cattle, copper and iron. Values were reckoned at first in cattle (one ox being equivalent to ten sheep), afterwards in copper, which passed from hand to hand in lumps (*aes rude*). It was not until the fourth century that this inconvenient currency, which involved frequent recourse to weighing, was superseded by a regular bronze coinage. (For the history of Roman money see VI 12.) As the power of Etruria declined, Romans claimed an increasing share in the maritime trade of the western Mediterranean. The number of Greek loan-words in the Latin nautical vocabulary shows that they learned seamanship from a Greek source; and there are indications that they were in closer touch with the Dorian cities of Sicily than with their neighbours in Campania. The Carthaginians, ever jealous of rivals in western waters, endeavoured by the treaties of 348 and 306 to limit the Roman sphere of influence; there is some doubt about their precise meaning, but the object of Carthage was to confine Roman trade to the west coast of Italy and Sicily. In the course of the third century, however, Rome made herself mistress of Italy, wrested from Carthage the islands of Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, put down piracy in the Adriatic (229—221), and finally broke her great rival's power (201).

625. Thenceforward the Romans and their allies could trade freely in all parts of the Mediterranean. Pūtēōli, a Greek port on the Bay of Naples which was made a Roman colony in 199, became the channel of trade with the East. Italian merchants settled in large numbers at Delos, which became a formidable rival to Rhodes as an emporium for the trade in slaves and other merchandise from the Black Sea, Syria and Egypt; it was made a free port in 168. The destruction of Carthage and of Corinth in 146 threw the trade from East to West more than ever into Italian hands. A swarm of speculators invaded the province of Asia, when it passed under Roman rule a few years later, and the process was repeated as each new province was acquired. Besides the *publicani* and their agents (§ 499) there were *negotiatores*, capitalists who undertook banking-business, and lent money on mortgage, and *mercatores* or dealers in special commodities. In Gallia Narbonensis we hear also of *aratores* and *pecuarii*, corn-growers and graziers who bought or rented large farms. In Spain fortunes were often made by speculators who obtained mining leases, and in Sicily and Africa by farming on the plantation system which had been brought to perfection by the Carthaginians.

The expansion of trade after the second Punic war brought developments in the commercial quarter at Rome. The *Emporium*, or line of quays extending southwards from the old salt-warehouses (*sālinae*) at the foot of the Aventine, was laid out in 193, and improved in 174 by the addition of paving and a flight of steps. The ground behind the quays began to be covered with warehouses (*horrea*) for the storage of grain and all kinds of merchandise. In 179 the first *macellum* or retail provision-market was built near the *forum*. The *forum* itself, no longer lined with

Later Republic-  
can period.

butchers' shops, came more and more to be 'an immense stock-exchange where monetary speculation of every kind was continually going on'<sup>1</sup>.

626. The port of Ostia, though so near to Rome, was always less important than that of Puteoli. The smaller craft of early Imperial Age. days came up the river, but before the time of Augustus merchant ships found the approach even to Ostia dangerous owing to the silting up of the channels. Claudius constructed a new harbour (*Portus Urbis* or *Augusti*), two miles west of Ostia, and Trajan enlarged it; he added an inner dock, hexagonal in form, with over a mile of quays surrounded by warehouses. Cargoes were thence conveyed to Rome by land (*Via Portuensis*) or towed up the river in barges drawn by oxen to the *Emporium*, or commercial port at the foot of the Aventine, which was divided into sections devoted to grain, oil, wine, salt, metals, marble and other goods. Here, as at Portus and at Ostia, the warehouses covered a huge area; some were public property, set apart for the produce furnished as *annona* by the provinces, others were in private hands. Many were devoted to the storage and sale of particular commodities such as paper, candles and pepper. There were numerous warehouses in other parts of the city, including safe-deposits in which customers could rent strong rooms and lockers.

627. The name *mercatores*, traders, includes both wholesale merchants (*magnarii*) and retailers (*manticularii*), who may be divided into shop-keepers (*tabernarii*) and various classes of itinerant dealers. From the wholesale warehouse (*horreum*) goods were constantly transferred to the shop (*taberna*) in which they were to be exposed for sale. Particular trades tended to congregate in particular streets; both at Rome and in the provinces we meet with such names as *Vicus Unguentarius* and *Forum Vestiarium*. The owner of a shop was often represented by a manager (*institor*), who might be a slave or freedman trading with his master's capital and paying him a fixed rate of interest; with such profits as he could make (*peculium*), the slave would eventually purchase his freedom; so too the freedman might save money and purchase the business and bequeath it to his free-born sons. Thus the class of free tradesmen was constantly recruited by the most efficient and intelligent members of the slave class. The feeling that petty trade was unworthy of a free citizen was strong in the later years of the Republic but tended to disappear under the early Empire; at this time the shop-keeper's pride in his calling often manifested itself in the sculpture on his tomb, representing his shop or the implements of his trade.

628. In early days grain was pounded in a mortar (hence *pistor* from *pinsere*, to pound), and the meal so produced was boiled into a kind of porridge (*puls*). Later the country household had its hand-mill and oven, but townfolk bought their bread from *pistores*, who were both millers and bakers. The mills were

Trades concerned with food.

<sup>1</sup> W. Cunningham, *Western Civilisation in its economic Aspects* (*Ancient Times*), 164.

worked by horses or donkeys, water-power being rarely used. Special branches of this, as of other trades, are denoted by adjectives in *-arius*, which occur in great variety on tomb-stones of the imperial age; such are *pistor candidarius*, and *dulciarius*. The butchers (*lānii*) bought their supplies in the *Forum Boarium* or *Suarium*, greengrocers in the *Forum Olitorium*. These and other ordinary provisions were sold in the provision-market (*macellum*) by *macellarii*, foreign delicacies by *cupedinarii*.

629. Originally all garments were of wool, spun and woven by the women of the household; and wool continued to be the material of the *toga*, but, for other garments, linen came into use under the Republic, as did silk and perhaps to some extent cotton under the Empire. Having been washed and carded the wool was spun with the aid of distaff (*cōlus*) and spindle (*jusus*), the latter being fitted with a whorl (*turbo*). Catullus (lxiv 311) describes the process:

Handicrafts  
connected  
with clothing.

Laeua colum molli lana retinebat amictum,  
dextera tum leuiter deducens fila supinis  
formabat digitis, tum prono in pollice torquens  
libratum tereti uersabat turbine fusum.

The thread was woven into cloth upon an upright loom (*tēla*). Its construction cannot be described here in detail, but the principal parts may be named. The upright threads of the warp (*stāmina*) were stretched from a yarn-beam (*iūgum*) above to a cloth-beam below. They were controlled by means of leashes or heddles (*licia*), loops connecting sets of threads with a moveable bar (*arundo*). In plain weaving two such bars were used. By moving one forward and the other back an opening was formed for passing the shuttle (*radius*) carrying the weft (*subtēmen*) between the threads of the warp. The horizontal threads of the woof (*subtēmen*, *trama*) were then driven close together with a comb (*pecten*). Patterns were obtained by increasing the number of sets of leashes, so that the weaver could move different groups of warp threads and vary the openings for the passage of the weft. We hear little of weaving being carried on in large factories; *textrīna* means a room in a private house, and it is probable that the market was mainly supplied from household looms.

The next process was not carried out in the house, except in very large establishments, but at the shop of a fuller (*jullo*). The woollen cloth was washed and trodden in order to remove its natural grease, and felt the threads into a compact uniform fabric. It was then combed so as to roughen the surface, shorn smooth and pressed. Fullers also undertook the cleaning of garments that had been worn, thus doing the work of the modern laundry. Dealers in clothing (*uestiarii*) must have been numerous; some sold cloth, others finished garments of various kinds (as *sagarii*, *caenularii*).

630. Hides passed through the hands of the tanner (*cōriarius*) into those of various leather-workers; *pelliones*, who made all kinds of saddlery, curtains for carriages and litters, and

Workers in  
leather.



military tents; and *sutores* or shoe-makers, divided into sandal-makers, from whom the *Vicus sandaliarius* at Rome took its name, *calceolarii* who made the aristocratic high boot, and numerous other special crafts. *Utricularii* prepared skins for the transport of wine and oil.

631. The worker in any hard material was called *fāber*, and his shop *fabrica*, the different handicrafts being distinguished by an epithet. When *faber* stands alone, it generally signifies a carpenter. Wood-workers may be divided into *fabri tignarii*, builders' carpenters responsible for structural timbers of house and roof, *f. navales*, shipwrights, *f. intestinarii*, joiners who made doors, windows and other internal woodwork, *f. plostarii* and *carpentarii*, cartwrights and carriage-builders. Furniture-makers must have formed a number of minor crafts; such names as *faber lectarius* appear in inscriptions, but a generic term is wanting. We may here mention the workers in ivory (*eborarii*), who turned the legs of tables and couches on the lathe (*tornus*). Metal-workers were described as *fabri aurarii*, *argentarii*, and so forth. The former, called also *aurifices*, included not only goldsmiths but jewellers and dealers in precious stones; the latter made costly and varied services of silver plate, such as those known to us from discoveries at Hildesheim and Boscoreale. These *argentarii uascularii* must be distinguished from the *argentarii* of the Forum, who were money-changers and bankers, and transacted all kinds of financial business, including the issue of bills of exchange (*permutatio*). The industry of the *faber aerarius* covers a wide field—bronze statues, armour, furniture, ornaments and domestic utensils in great variety. Blacksmiths (*fabri ferrarii*) were to be found in all parts of the Empire. Roman tomb-stones record the names of special crafts engaged in making knives, sickles or swords. Lead-workers (*plumbarii*) were chiefly engaged in the manufacture and laying of water-pipes (*fistula*, hence *fistulatores*). The work of the potter (*figulus*) included the manufacture of bricks, tiles and large storage-vessels (*opus doliāre*) on the one hand and of fine earthenware (*opus figlinum*) on the other. Brickfields, owned and exploited by capitalists, abounded near Rome and occasionally exported their products to distant provinces. The manufacture of finer pottery was in the hands of small firms, the best known centre being Arretium. Lastly, mention must be made of the barbers (*tonsores*), who were of necessity numerous in a society which had adopted the Hellenistic fashion of wearing the hair short and shaving daily; the *tonstrinae* were notorious centres of gossip.

632. The old yeoman household had been largely self-sufficient, but, after the decay of agriculture, the average Roman, unlike the Greek, was slow to adopt a handicraft, though he was an enterprising trader. 'Perhaps' (as has been said) 'there has never been a great city so unproductive as ancient Rome'.<sup>1</sup> There were few manufactures in the capital: cheap clothing, shoes and

Workers in  
wood, metal  
and clay.

Local distribu-  
tion of indus-  
tries: Rome.

<sup>1</sup> E. Speck, *Handelsgeschichte des Allertums*, § 773.

farm-implements had been made there under the Republic; glass and paper-works were started under the Empire. The rapid growth of Rome and of the pleasure-cities which lined the adjoining coast fostered many industries in their neighbourhood:—quarries, limekilns, brick and tile works. The increase of luxury suggested novel uses for land, such as rearing all kinds of poultry and game, even wild boars and peacocks and minor delicacies such as snails, for the table. Market gardens covered a large area. Roses and violets were grown for making perfumes in Latium and Campania. The demand for purple encouraged the looms, the purple fisheries and the dye-works of Calabria and Lucania.

633. Some of the Etruscan cities retained their industrial character, producing linen, woollens and carpets. The fine red pottery of Arretium commanded a wide market in Italy and the provinces, and was occasionally exported as far as Britain; but, towards the middle of the first century after Christ, Gaulish imitations, made in the valleys of Aveyron and the Allier, took its place even in Italy. The marble quarries of Luna (*Carrara*) and the iron ore of Ilva (*Elba*) are important exceptions to the rule that most of the Italian *metalla* were closed under the Empire. The application of capital and skill to agriculture produced its happiest results in regions like the valley of the Po where the soil was still virgin. This district, now one of the most highly cultivated in Europe, was at the beginning of the second century mainly forest and marsh. Next we hear of extensive pig-breeding, and then, under the early Empire, of heavy crops of millet, huge wine-casks, and flourishing woollen industries. Patauium, the richest city of North Italy, was famous for carpets and for a stout frieze called *gausāpa*, used for wraps and coverlets; Verona for strong blankets, *lōdices*; the region between Po and Ticinus for linens; Mutina for fine woollens and for pottery; Comum for iron. Coarse woollen clothing for slaves came from Liguria.

634. Pūteōli first became important in the second century before Christ, and developed rapidly after the fall of Delos. Sheltered, easy of access, and situated near the Via Appia, it became the chief port of Italy. Passengers, letters and valuable cargo were disembarked here to avoid the delays involved in landing at any of the ports of Rome. It was also a great *entrepôt* in which goods from one province were transhipped for distribution to others. These facilities for export stimulated local industries, such as the manufacture of iron tools carried on at Puteoli itself, and the potteries and bronze foundries of Capua and other neighbouring towns. Some of the bronze works of art and most of the bronze furniture and utensils found at Herculaneum and Pompeii must have been produced in the district. Similar bronze utensils, stamped with the names of Campanian factories, have been found in considerable numbers both in the northern provinces and in regions of Germany and Scandinavia far outside the frontier. They probably formed part of mixed

Etruria.

The valley of  
the Po.

Puteoli and  
Capua.

cargoes shipped from Puteoli to the frontier provinces. Eastern wares and articles of luxury played a great part in this trade. The name *sēplasiarius*, derived from the *Sēplasia* or unguent-market of Capua, was adopted by vendors of toilet articles all over western Europe.

635. Other ports had only a local importance—Genoa for Liguria, Ancona for Umbria and Picenum, Ravenna for the Po basin, Regium for Sicily. Tarentum maintained relations with Greece; Brundisium was chiefly used by travellers going to the East. From most of them oil and wine of excellent quality were exported to the provinces; corn on the other hand was grown in Italy only for local consumption in districts which could not supply themselves from abroad.

636. The chief exports of Spain were minerals, gold from the rivers of the west coast and from mines in Asturia, lead from near Spain. Castūlo on the upper Baetis, copper from the mountains north of Cordūba (the *Sierra Morena*) and from the region west of Hispālis (the *Rio Tinto*), quicksilver from Sisāpo (*Almaden*), and iron from several districts in the North. The output of silver, which the Carthaginians had obtained in abundance from lead-mines near Nova Carthago, was unimportant in later Roman days. Wine and oil were shipped from Baetica, dried fish from the ports on the south coast; among manufactures we hear of woven stuffs from Lusitania, linen from Tarraconensis, and steel blades from Tōlētum (*Toledo*) and Bilbilis. Gades acquired great wealth, both as port of shipment for the products of Baetica, and as headquarters of the coasting trade with western Europe and north-western Africa. Tarrāco was the chief place on the east coast, in constant communication with Ostia and Puteoli. Minor ports were Valentia and Nova Carthago, and Barcīno (*Barcelona*), which was destined to succeed Tarrāco as capital of this region under the Moors.

637. The minerals of Gaul were insignificant in comparison with those of Spain. Silver and copper were worked in Aquitaine, iron Gaul. among the Bitūrīges Cūbi (*Berri*) and Petrōcōrii (*Périgord*). But there were important textile industries, woollens made by the Atrēbātes (near *Arras*) and Santōnes (*Saintes*), linens by the Cadurci (*Cahors*) and other peoples of Aquitaine; manufactures of 'Samian' pottery among the Rūtēni (*Aveyron*) and Aruerni (*Auvergne*), and of glass, bronze and other hardwares. The vine, which was largely cultivated in southern Gaul, in spite of restrictions imposed in the interest of Italian growers, gradually spread northwards until in the fourth century there were vineyards along the Seine and the Moselle. Ārēlātē (*Arles*) took the place of Massilia as the chief port on the south coast. An important route led from Narbo to Burdigāla (*Bordeaux*). Trade with Britain passed through Gēsōriācum (*Boulogne*) or Iūliōbōna (*Lillebonne*).

638. Among the motives for the conquest of Britain was the hope of finding mineral wealth. Lead-mines were worked in the Britain. Mendips, Shropshire, Derbyshire and Flint, copper pro-

bably in Anglesey, and a little gold in South Wales. Iron was smelted in the Weald of Sussex and the Forest of Dean. There is little, on the other hand, to show that the Romans developed the Cornish tin-mines; the increasing use of zinc for alloying copper (the result being brass, not bronze) must have diminished the demand for tin. The island also exported hides, woollens, corn (principally to the Rhine, where large quantities were required for the troops), hunting-dogs, baskets, oysters and a few pearls. The old native art of enamelling on bronze continued to flourish, but the finest traditions of Celtic design in metal-work were preserved only outside the frontier, in Scotland and Ireland. The coasts of Ireland had been surveyed and the geography of the interior was well known in the second century, as appears from Ptolemy's description. Tacitus speaks of the frequent visits of Roman traders; but their wares have left few traces, and coins are rare. The stamp of an itinerant oculist, found in Tipperary, is an indication that there was some real intercourse; probably it was with north-western Gaul rather than with Britain.

639. Germany must have had a considerable transit-trade, importing Baltic amber, slaves, furs and other foreign goods, which were paid for partly in wine, partly in coin, partly in cloth, cutlery, hardware and the like. Markets were established along the frontier for traffic between the barbarians and the subjects of the Empire; there is reason to think that in some cases these survived far into the Middle Ages. In Germany there was a considerable development of local industries, potteries at Tabernae (*Rheinzabern*) in the Palatinate, glass-works and brass-foundries near Cologne. Some of these goods were shipped to Britain from a port near Middelburg in the island of Walcheren; among a number of votive inscriptions found in the remains of a temple is one set up by a *negotiator cretarius Britannicianus*, 'an exporter of pottery to Britain', whose name shows that he came from Cologne. The trade of the Upper Danube was similar to that of Germany. Carnuntum was the starting point from which traders sometimes made their way to the amber coast. Under Tiberius we hear of fortunes made by *negotiatores* who settled at the capital of King Marōbōduus in Bohemia. The conquest of Dacia opened up the valuable gold mines in the upper valley of the Marisia (*Maros*) near Vasarhely in Transylvania.

640. Nōricum produced excellent iron; Dalmātia, iron and a little gold and silver. The coast-lands of Illyricum, Macedonia and Thrace exported wine, timber, pickled fish and various textiles. The gold and silver mines of Mount Pangaeus in Macedonia had been worked on a large scale long before the Roman annexation and were closed in 158 B.C., but silver, copper and iron continued to be produced from mines further west. The chief ports of this region were Sālōnae in Dalmatia; Dyrrhachium and Aulon, the starting points of the Via Egnatia on the west coast of Macedonia; and Thessalonica and Amphipolis on the east coast.

The Rhine and Danube provinces.

The Balkan provinces.



641. The economic exhaustion of Greece left small opportunity for trade. Roman enterprise developed one source of natural wealth of which little use had been made, the coloured marbles of Thāsos, Scyros and Carystus in Euboea, the green porphyry of Crōcēa in Laconia, and the serpentine of Tēnos. Most of these were worked by procurators on behalf of the imperial domain, as were the older quarries of Pāros and Hymettus. By exception those of Pentēlicus were in private hands. The other products of Greece were wines, fine woven stuffs, and perfumes. Laconia, at this time more prosperous than other regions, exported horses and dogs, woollens and purple dye. Piraeus had dwindled to a village, but Corinth (see § 659) with its two ports was a busy place, and Patrae and Gythium had grown into local importance. Crete, which may be mentioned here though for administrative purposes it was attached to Cyrenaica, yielded a regular supply of medicinal herbs and drugs, which were collected and shipped to Rome by imperial agents.

Greece and the  
Greek islands.

642. In Asia Minor, as in Greece, coloured marble was more abundant than metals, the most famous being that of Synnāda in Phrygia. Lead and copper were worked in Cilicia, iron in Cappadocia; above all the copper mines of Cyprus were still productive, and the late Latin word *cuprum* (for *aes Cyprium*) survives as the name of copper in most European languages. Wines were furnished by the west coast of Asia Minor and the adjacent islands of Lesbos, Chios, Cos and Rhodes, and figs by the valley of the Maeander. Miletus and Laodicea were noted for their woollens, and a variety of textiles came from Ancyra and other districts. Ephesus was the chief emporium on the west coast; Cyzicus and Nicomedia on the Propontis; Amastris (now more important than Sinōpē) on the Euxine; Rhodes, Attalia and Tarsus on the south coast.

Asia Minor  
and Cyprus.

643. The remarkable prosperity of Syria resulted both from the industrial activity of its numerous towns and from the transit-trade between Rome and the East which passed through its ports. Flax, grown locally, and raw silk imported from China were woven on the looms of Tyre, Bērytus and other towns. The finer silks and linens were dyed in the purple works of Tyre. Sidon had large glass-works. These products and the caravan goods brought from the Persian Gulf by way of Palmyra, or by the Petra-Gaza route from the Red Sea, were conveyed by Syrian merchants to all parts of the Empire. Guilds of Syrian traders were to be found in all the ports of the Mediterranean and in many inland cities. Thus the profits of western trade flowed back to Syria; the whole valley of the Orontes is studded with the remains of country towns, villas and farms, the homes of these thriving merchants. Unlike Alexandria, Antioch was mainly a pleasure-city, without local industries. The two desert cities of Petra and Palmyra, *entrepôts* on the caravan routes already mentioned, derived their wealth from tolls on the

Syria.

goods passing through them. Petra was governed by Nabatean princes until the time of Trajan, Palmyra by its own magistrates until the fall of Zenobia in 273.

644. There were two overland routes from the eastern frontier to the commercial centres of Bactria, where traders from the west met caravans bringing silk and other wares from Serica (China) and India. The first led from the Black Sea to the Caspian, and thence up the Oxus into Bactria. The second was a continuation of the eastern trade-route from Ephesus to Cappadocia. It descended the Tigris valley as far as Arbēla, thence reached Ecbātāna and continued eastward by one of several alternative routes to Ortospāna near *Kabul*. These two routes were closed to Roman traders in consequence of the Parthian war (162-6), and the plague which afterwards devastated Parthia. The Roman 'embassy', recorded in Chinese annals as having brought gifts to the court of China in 166, was (it has been conjectured) a commercial mission organised by Syrian firms desirous of reopening trade with China by way of Ceylon.

645. Alexandria was the busiest port in the Mediterranean, since through it passed the bulk of the trade with Arabia and India. It was also a great industrial centre, in which linen and cotton goods, paper and glass, were manufactured for export. Similar industries flourished in many of the towns on the Nile, but the majority of the dense population were engaged in agriculture; Egypt provided one-third of the corn-supply of Rome. Grey and red granite, basalt, porphyry and alabaster were exported from quarries in the Thebaid and near Sŷēnē (*Assuan*), and numerous mines were worked on the coast of the Red Sea. Ivory, wild beasts, and other southern merchandise came down the Nile from the Soudan and by way of Adūlis on the Red Sea from Ethiopia. All the resources of the country were exploited to the utmost to swell the revenues of the emperor, for Egypt was administered as his private domain. The transit-trade between East and West was carefully fostered and made to flow so far as possible through Egyptian channels.

646. Until Roman imperial times the trade of the Red Sea was controlled by the Sabæans of south-eastern Arabia, their chief emporium being Adānē (*Aden*). They brought the wares of Yemen and of India to one of the two Egyptian ports on the Red Sea (Berenicē and Myōs Hormōs) from which caravan-routes led to Coptos on the Nile. Augustus and his successors improved these roads and ports, encouraged Roman shipping by differential port-dues, and sent expeditions against the Arabs, in one of which Adanē was destroyed. In Strabo's day as many as 120 merchant-ships sailed each year from Myos Hormos alone, and soon afterwards one Hippālus discovered the possibility of making the direct voyage to India with the help of the monsoon, thenceforward called after him. Pliny estimated that goods and money to the value of 100,000,000 sesterces left

Overland trade  
with the Far  
East.

Egypt.

Trade with  
Arabia  
and India.

the Roman Empire every year in exchange for Arabian and Indian wares. A detailed account of this commerce is furnished by the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*, a guide-book written by a Greek merchant resident in Egypt and containing particulars of trading-places on the coast of Arabia, Africa and India, and their exports and imports. From time immemorial the Arabs had exported frankincense, gums, spices, drugs and precious stones. India supplied these and similar wares in great variety, pepper, ivory and ebony, tortoise-shell, pearls, slaves, and wild beasts for the amphitheatre. In exchange the traders brought raw and manufactured metals, wine—always an item in Roman trade with barbarians, gorgeous woven stuffs and glass wares from Egyptian factories, European gems, corals and drugs; but there remained a balance which had to be made up in coined money. Numerous Roman coins have been found in the west coast of India, especially in the pepper districts of Malabar and further south, and to a less extent in Ceylon; they are rare on the east coast. As was the case long afterwards in the Portuguese and Venetian trade with India, enormous profits were made out of pepper. It fetched high prices in Italy, and was probably in request among the northern barbarians as well as within the Empire, if we may judge from the fact that 3000 pounds of it were included in the ransom which Alaric demanded after the first Gothic siege of Rome.

647. The territories comprised in the provinces of Africa and Mauretania were more prosperous under the Roman Empire than ever before or since. The ports of Syrtica (the later *Tripolis*), particularly Leptis Magna and Tacāpē (*Gabes*), controlled the trade-routes by which slaves, gold dust, ivory, ebony and wild beasts were brought from the country of the Garamantes (*Fezzan*) and regions further south. The difficulties in the way of trans-Saharan journeys have increased in recent centuries owing to the encroachment of the desert; on the other hand, before the introduction of the camel, which took place in Roman times, transport depended on slave carriers. In any case the volume of the trade was small, and the prosperity of the African provinces was mainly derived from agriculture. Africa proper, the region in which the old Phœnician settlements lay thickest, yielded vast quantities of grain and oil, and under the Antonines parts of Numidia and Mauretania had become equally productive. The African provinces furnished one-third of the annual corn-supply of Rome. Other exports were the purple-dye of the island of Meninx (*Djerba*), the sponges of the Syrtes, and the red-veined *marmor Numidicum* of Simitthus near Hippo Regius. Carthage after her restoration by Julius Caesar soon recovered her primacy in commerce, and her rivals, Hippo Diarrhÿtus and Utica, declined. The other ports of Africa were Hadrumētum (*Sousse*) and Rūsicādē (*Philippeville*): of Mauretania, Caesarea (*Cherchel*) and Tingi (*Tangier*).

648. Vast as were the dominions of Rome, varied as were their climatic conditions and products, she could not supply all her needs

without drawing extensively upon the resources of neighbouring regions.

Foreign  
commerce of  
Rome, and its  
economic  
results.

Thus, in the course of centuries, she brought about grave economic changes in countries of which her statesmen had little knowledge, and over which they exercised no direct control. The staple of this external trade varied in different regions, but was always some article of luxury, the price of which at its destination could bear the cost of a long voyage or land-journey and of customs and other dues paid by the way, in addition to the heavy profit which the merchant expected to make after his perilous venture. On the overland routes of North Africa it was ivory, slaves and gold-dust; on the sea-route from Ceylon and the Malabar coast to the Red Sea, pepper and other eastern spices; on the overland route from China to the Euphrates, silks; and along the northern frontier, slaves, amber and furs. The custom-duties paid on foreign goods, particularly at the Red Sea frontier, brought in large sums, and the confident frontier-policy of the early Empire relaxed the prohibition, often enacted under the Republic, of the export of gold or silver. This prolonged outflow of the precious metals and the gradual exhaustion of mines led, in the long run, to the depreciation of the coinage and the economic ruin of the Empire. The disorders of the third century, during which the barbarians overran the Empire by land and sea, went far to extinguish trade. About the year 300, after the restoration of peace and public order, Diocletian and his co-rulers found themselves face to face with a commercial crisis. Interest was excessive, owing to the scarcity of capital, and the price of commodities and labour had risen in proportion. In 301 they issued the so-called Edict of Diocletian, which was an attempt (necessarily unsuccessful) to fix the maximum prices for different kinds of goods and labour. Portions of it engraved on stone, both in Greek and Latin, have been discovered in various cities of Greece, Asia Minor and Egypt, the provinces ruled by Diocletian.

Industry and Commerce. Mommsen, *History of Rome* i, Bk i, chap. xiii;

Bibliography. W. Cunningham, *An Essay on Western Civilisation in its economic aspects* (*Ancient Times*), Cambridge, 1902; W. Richter,

*Handel u. Verkehr der wichtigsten Völker des Mittelmeers*, Leipzig, 1886; H. Blümner, *Die gewerbliche Thätigkeit der Völker des klassischen Alterthums*, Leipzig, 1869, and his later works, *Technologie u. Terminologie der Gewerbe u. Künste bei Griechen u. Römern*, 4 vols. *ib.* 1875-87, and *Die römischen Privat-altertümer*, pp. 589-656, München, 1912; Büchschütz, *Die Hauptstätten des Gewerbfleisses im klassischen Alterthume*, 1869; Daremberg-Saglio, *Dict. des Antiquités s.v. Mercator, Mercatura, Negotiator*; Marquardt, *Privatleben der Römer*, ed. 2, 1886, vol. vii of Marquardt u. Mommsen, *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer*; F. Hirth, *China and the Roman Orient*; Pârvan, *Die Nationalität der Kaufleute im römischen Kaiserreiche* (Breslau dissertation, 1909).



## VI. 10. (B) ROADS AND TRAVEL.

649. THE main roads of the Roman Empire (*viae publicae, militares*) were made, maintained and owned by the State. Those of Italy were originally made by censors and bore their names (e.g. *Via Appia*); those of the provinces, by provincial governors or emperors. After the abolition of the censorship by Augustus the roads were superintended by commissioners (*curatores viarum*); repairs were executed by contractors (*manicipes, redemptores*), the landowners paying a fixed contribution towards the cost. Side-roads (*viae vicinales*) leading to or through a *vicus* (*Digest*, xliii 8, 2), were controlled by the local magistrates and kept in repair by the landowners. There were also private roads (*viae privatae*), made and owned by private persons. Italy and the provinces must have been covered by a network of these minor roads. In some cases their course can be made out, but they were less solidly constructed than the main highways, and have left few conspicuous traces. On the other hand, the main roads with their bridges and milestones are among the most durable monuments of Roman rule. From the Euphrates to the Atlantic and from the Mediterranean to the Rhine, travellers and traders moved along them with a freedom and security such as were unknown for many centuries after.

Roads.

650. Our information about them is derived from several sources. (1) The date of their construction is in some cases recorded by historians and their general course by geographical writers. (2) The *Antonine Itinerary*, a road-book compiled about the end of the second century after Christ, enumerates the principal towns and posting-stations on many of the main roads. It also gives distances, but the figures are often corrupt and identifications based on them are insecure. Fuller details about particular roads are furnished by the *Jerusalem Itinerary* (333 A.D., Bordeaux to Jerusalem by Arles, Milan, Constantinople and Antioch), and by the inscriptions on four silver vases dedicated by Spanish visitors at the baths of Vicarello in North Italy; they are shaped like milestones and give the stages and distances from Cadiz to Rome (*C.I.L.* xi 3281-4). (3) The *Peutinger Table*, so called after the scholar who owned it in the sixteenth century, is a copy made in the thirteenth century from an ancient road-map of the Roman Empire, arranged in strips for convenient use in travelling. It covers almost the whole of the Empire except Britain, of which only the south-east corner is preserved. (4) Our knowledge is completed by the actual remains of the roads, and by the milestones and other inscribed monuments found along their course.

651. The practice of setting up stone pillars to mark distances formed part of the Ptolemaic road-system, and was probably known in other

Hellenistic kingdoms. The oldest known Roman example comes from the *Via Appia*, and may be dated about 250 B.C. The road to Spain through Southern Gaul was marked out with milestones before 123 B.C., and, about the same time, the first pro-consul of the new province of Asia was setting them up on the roads starting from Ephesus and Pergamon. But they did not come into general use until the reign of Augustus. The road-system of the Empire radiated from the *miliarium aureum*, engraved with names and distances, which he set up in the Forum at Rome. It was probably a polygonal column; a humble example of the type has been found at Tongres in Belgium, inscribed on its eight faces with the itinerary of eight radiating roads. The ordinary milestone was a rough cylindrical pillar from three to nine feet high, usually about six feet, often with a square base cut out of the same block; it was inscribed with the name and titles (indicating the year) of the emperor in whose reign it was set up. Sometimes the name of a dead emperor was erased to make room for his successor's, sometimes a new stone was erected; groups of as many as six or eight have been found together. The emperor's name is generally in the dative and may be followed by that of the town or canton (*ciuitas*) which set up the stone. The distance from one or more important stations is sometimes added, the unit of measurement being the Roman mile. (But the Gaulish *leuga* or league, equivalent to  $1\frac{1}{2}$  Roman miles, was the official unit in Gaul from the time of Trajan and in Germany from that of Severus.) More than 4000 inscribed milestones have been discovered in different parts of the Roman Empire.

**652.** The first great military road was the *Via Appia*, one of the public works planned by the censor of 312 B.C., Appius Claudius; crossing the Pontine marshes on a high embankment, it connected Rome with Capua, and secured the hold of Rome on Campania. In strength and beauty of construction, and in the undeviating directness of its course, it set the standard which Roman engineers followed for centuries after. The end of the long war with the Samnites in 290 was followed by the creation of a strong colony at Venusia on their southern flank, and then, or soon afterwards, the *Via Appia* was prolonged by way of Beneuentum across the Apennines, and, twenty years later, to the sea-ports of Tarentum and Brundisium. The *Via Popilia*, named after its builder, the consul of 132, connected Capua with Regium<sup>1</sup> and provided communication over-land with Lucania, the Bruttian peninsula, and Sicily.

**653.** The *Via Flaminia* ascended the valley of the Tiber and continued through Umbria and over the Apennines to the port of Ariminum. It was completed about B.C. 220 by C. Flaminius Nepos, but had, in great part, been laid out about 300, after the subjugation of central Italy. It originally terminated at Narnia, a military colony interposed between the Sabines and Etruscans. About the

The southern roads.

The northern roads.

<sup>1</sup> The Latin form of *Rhegium*; see p. 10, n. 1.

same time, the road from Rome to Tibur, afterwards called *Via Valeria*, was prolonged eastwards to the sea at Aternum (*Pescara*), and a garrison was placed midway along it at Alba Fuentia overlooking the Fucine lake and the territory of the Marsi. In Etruria the Romans found two main lines of traffic ready-made, one skirting the coast to Populonia, Pisa and Luna, the other traversing Volsinii, Clusium and Arrêtium. The former was improved about 123, and became the *Via Aurelia*; the latter became the *Via Cassia* (170?). In 187 the construction of the *Via Aemilia* from Ariminum to Placentia marks an important step forward; this extension of the road-system beyond the Apennines was the logical consequence of the annexation of Gallia Cispadana, by which the Po became the Roman frontier. The cities in the former territory of the Boii which now became Roman colonies, Bononia, Mūtina, Parma, Placentia and several others, all lie on the *Via Aemilia*, and have continued to play an important part in history. About the same time the *Via Aurelia*, already mentioned, was completed as far as Luna and linked up with the *Via Cassia* by a road running parallel to the Apennines on the south, as the *Via Aemilia* ran parallel to them on the north; it went from Arrêtium by way of Florentia to Luca, and there branched to Pisa and Luna. The great Ligurian port of Gēnūa was the starting point for the *Via Postumia*, constructed in 148, which crossed Italy from sea to sea by way of Dertona, Placentia, Cremona and Verona to Aquileia. It was not until B.C. 108 that Aemilius Scaurus extended the *Via Aemilia* from Luna to Genua—the new strip was called *Via Aemilia Scauri*—along the steep shores of the Italian Riviera.

654. The regular route to Transalpine Gaul and Spain by sea, but means of communication by land were required after the creation of the *Prouincia Narbonensis*. The maintenance of the road from the Alps to the Rhone was entrusted to the people of Massilia. Its westward continuation, the *Via Domitia*, was constructed by Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus about 120. In like manner the annexation of Macedonia (146) was followed by the construction of the *Via Egnatia*, which traversed the Balkan Peninsula from sea to sea, starting at Apollonia and Dyrrhachium, and crossing the mountains to Thessalonica. In the province of Asia existing roads were improved and probably extended from 129 onwards. Thus it was in the second half of the first century B.C. that Rome applied to her new provinces the policy, which had proved so successful in Italy, of consolidating her conquests by a network of roads and fortresses. The closing years of the Republic witnessed comparatively little making of roads or other public works, but after the civil wars Augustus, through his great lieutenant Agrippa, organised a survey of the Empire which was accompanied by a great improvement in means of communication. It will be convenient to deal with the provinces one by one.

The beginning of roadmaking in the provinces.

655. The old *Via Domitia* certainly extended beyond the Pyrenees. As improved by Augustus, the *Via Augusta* ran by way of Tarrāco, capital

of the province of Tarraconensis, down the coast to Valentia and thence westward over the central plateau into Baetica and by Corduba and Hispalis (*Seville*) to the great port of Gades. Another branch turned west to Ilerda after the crossing of the Pyrenees and reached the Ibērus (*Ebro*) at Caesaraugusta (*Saragossa*), a meeting-place of many roads; the two most important led, one by Bilbilis and Tolētum (*Toledo*) to Emērita Augusta (*Merida*), the capital of Lusitania, with a continuation to Ōlisipo (*Lisbon*) at the mouth of the Tagus; the other to Astūrica, the chief place of the Asturian district, with a continuation to Brăcăra Augusta, the chief place of Gallaecia. The plateau of the interior was also crossed from north to south by a road which connected Hispalis and other towns on the lower Baetis, and the ports from its mouth to that of the Anas (*Guadiana*), with Emērita, Salmantica (*Salamanca*) and Asturica. Lastly Nova Carthago on the south-east coast was connected by two roads with the *Via Augusta*.

**656.** At the time of Caesar's conquest, Gaul was well supplied both with roads and with navigable water-ways. It is difficult to say how far the Roman highways followed old lines, but in any case 'the difference between a Roman road and the Gallic forest-tracks was at least as great as the difference between the modern road and the railway'<sup>1</sup>. The oldest road into Gaul followed the coast from Genua to Forum Iulii and thence turned inland due west to Aquae Sextiae (*Aix*), Massilia, and Arēlātē (*Arles*), where it crossed the Rhone and continued as the *Via Domitia* by Nemausus (*Nîmes*) to Narbo. There it forked, continuing to the Pyrenees on the one hand, and on the other to Tolosa on the upper Garonne and to Burdigāla (*Bordeaux*) near its mouth. It was by this route that the early traffic between Italy and the tin district of south-western Britain was carried on. A second road crossed the Alps by the pass of Mont Genève, 100 miles further north. It was reached from Augusta Taurinorum (*Turin*) on the upper Po by a road which followed a tributary westwards to Sēgūsio (*Susa*), the capital of the loyal king Cottius, whose name survives in that of the Cottian Alps. This is a low and easy pass communicating both to S.W. with Arles and to N.W. with Vienna (*Vienne*) and Lugudūnum or Lugdūnum (*Lyon*). Augustus also opened up the great and little St Bernard passes, after exterminating the Salassi whose extortions had practically closed them to travellers. They were reached from Mediolanum (*Milan*), the chief road centre of Cis-Alpine Gaul, by way of Ēpōrēdia (*Ivrea*) and the new military colony of Augusta Praetoria (*Aosta*). The little St Bernard led westward down the Isère to Vienna, the great St Bernard (Summus Poeninus) into the upper Rhone above the lake of Geneva and thence through Swiss valleys to the Rhine. (Cp. § 3, with note.)

The road system of central and northern Gaul had its centre at Lugdūnum. One important road ran west through Aquitania to Mediolanum Santonum (*Saintes*) at the mouth of the Garonne; another descended

<sup>1</sup> W. T. Arnold, *Studies of Roman Imperialism*, p. 90.



the valley of the Loire to Avāricum (*Bourges*) and Caesārōdūnum (*Tours*), with branches to Orleans and Poitiers; another followed the Arar (*Saône*) to Cabillonum (*Châlons*) where it forked; the western branch proceeded by Augustodunum to the ports of Iūliōbōna (*Lillebonne*) at the mouth of the Seine and Gēsōriācum, afterwards Bononia (*Boulogne*), from which passengers embarked for Britain, while the eastern branch followed the river Dūbis (*Doubs*) to the Rhine. The road from Châlons to Boulogne skirted the basin of the Seine and its tributaries on the east, passing by Troyes, Reims, Soissons, and Amiens. At Reims a branch turned east, reaching the Moselle at Augusta Trēuērorum (*Trier*) and ultimately joining the main Rhine valley road a little below Moguntiācum (*Mainz*). Thence it followed the river-frontier by Colonia Agrippina (*Cologne*) to Lugdūnum Batāuorum (*Leyden*) near its mouth.

657. Cāmūlōdūnum (*Colchester*), the chief centre of Roman influence before the conquest, and the first seat of Roman govern- Britain.  
ment, was connected by road with the three Kentish ports of Richborough, Dover and Lymne. Londinium, where this road crossed the Thames, became a centre of trade and the starting-point of fresh roads. (1) *South-west* (a) to Chichester ('Stone Street'); (b) to Southampton Water, by Silchester and Winchester; (c) to Exeter, by Silchester and Dorchester. Exeter marked the western limit of Roman civilisation. (2) *West* to Aquae Sulis (*Bath*). Silchester, the point at which the three last-named ways diverged, was laid out as a model city in the first century, perhaps by Agricola. The Bath road was prolonged to Isca Silūrum (*Caerleon*), where the Second Legion lay, and on to Carmarthen. Another way to Carmarthen went by Silchester, Cirencester, Gloucester and Brecon. (3) *North-West* to Viroconium (*Wroxeter*), the station of the Fourteenth Legion in the first century ('Watling Street'). It is prolonged to north and south so as to connect Wroxeter with the legion-fortresses of Isca and Deua (*Chester*), and may have been laid out during the operations against Silūres and Ordouices. (4) *North* to Ēbūrācum<sup>1</sup> (*York*), the station first of the Ninth and then of the Sixth Legion, by Lincoln ('Ermine Street'). It was prolonged in the second century to Corstopitum (*Corbridge*), south of Hadrian's Wall, and in the following reign to the east end of the Wall of Antoninus Pius, on the Firth of Forth. In northern England it is called 'Watling Street.' At Catterick in Yorkshire a branch turns north-west to Luguallium (*Carlisle*) and the outpost of Birrens in Dumfries; and it would doubtless have been prolonged to the west end of the Antonine Wall, had not the occupation of this region been cut short. (5) Some other main-roads must be mentioned. The 'Foss-way' runs south-west from Lincoln to Bath, and on to Exeter. The Caerleon-Wroxeter-Chester road threw out branches by Manchester to York, or by Ribchester up the

<sup>1</sup> Alcuin, who was educated in York, begins an hexameter line with *moenibus Euboricae*, probably a metrical licence. The general rule is that, in names of towns, the *a* of *-acum* is long after a consonant, and short after a vowel.

west coast to Carlisle. From Chester another road ran west to Carnarvon by Canouium (*Caerhun*), whence a mountain-way branched off southwards ('Sarn Helen') and joined the Carmarthen road, avoiding (as in Cornwall) the harbours of the south-west.

**658.** The Rhine-valley road already mentioned was improved by Trajan before his Dacian campaigns and linked up with his new road along the Danube. From Cisalpine Gaul two mountain-roads led to Augusta Vindēlicorum, the chief place of Raetia, one starting from Milan over the Splügen, the other from Verona over the Brenner. The latter dated from the campaign of Drusus (B.C. 15). From Verona the *Via Postumia* led east to Aquileia at the head of the Adriatic, the centre of a long-standing trade with Nōricum and Pannonia. The most frequented of several routes over the Julian Alps descended on Emōna (*Laybach*) and then forked, one branch going north-east to the great military station of Carnuntum, the other south-east to Siscia, where it reached the navigable waters of the Save and followed the valley to Sirmium and Singidūnum (*Belgrade*); thence it ascended the Morava valley to Naissus (*Nisch*) and took the same course as the modern railway by Serdica (*Sofia*) to Byzantium. From Chalcedōn, on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus, this route continued east to the Euphrates frontier and south-east to Central Asia Minor and Syria (see § 660 below).

**659.** Owing to the structure of the Roman Empire, which embraced the whole Mediterranean, and the position of Rome itself, on a peninsula projecting into the centre of this 'Roman lake', communication by sea was often quicker and easier than by land. Under the Republic, Gaul and Spain were usually approached by ship; it was only under the Empire that the Alpine roads came into regular use. Again, it was possible to shorten the voyage to Africa by taking the *Via Popilia* to Regium, crossing the straits, and following the road along the north coast of Sicily from Messina to Lilybaeum, whence it was but 80 miles to Utica and Carthage. But these circuitous routes were only adopted by luxurious travellers resolved at any cost to avoid the sea, and were out of the question for commercial transport. It was different with

**Sea-routes.** the routes for the East. (1) The overland route to Asia by the Apian and Egnatian ways was more direct, though more laborious; and it could be traversed in winter, when the sea was closed. It is probable that the couriers of the imperial post commonly travelled by this route, taking ship only between Brundisium and Aulōn, the port of Apollonia, and between Neāpolis, the port of Philippi, and Alexandria Troas; it was also possible to follow a longer land-route from Philippi, crossing the Hellespont at Lampsacus. From Troas this route continued to Pergamon, the capital of Asia, and to Sardis, where it joined one or other of the main routes which traversed the central highlands from west to east (see § 660). Diverging from the Euphrates route at the Galatian Laodicea, this road continued through the pass in the

The Danube  
provinces.

Routes to the  
East.

Taurus range called the Cicilian Gates, to Tarsus and Antioch, and eventually along the coast to Alexandria. Sir William Ramsay has given reasons for thinking that official despatches to Syria and Egypt were conveyed by this land-route, except during the summer months, when it was possible to count upon a rapid sea-passage from Pütöoli to Alexandria. Thus, in A.D. 193, the accession of the emperor Pertinax, who was proclaimed at Rome on January 1st, was officially announced at Alexandria on March 6th (estimated distance 2420 miles by road, 2 days for crossing the Adriatic, and 3 days from Neapolis, in Macedonia, to Troas). (2) On the other hand, in the open season (May to September) the corn-fleets sailed direct from Pütöoli to Alexandria, keeping to the south of Crete. A 'record passage' of nine days mentioned by Pliny must have been quite exceptional, but the dating of a papyrus shows that the accession of Galba (June 9) was known at Alexandria within 27 days. In the favourable season, other ships would make equally rapid voyages to the ports of western Greece and Asia Minor. (3) Between these two extremes, the long sea-voyage only practicable in summer, and the long land-journey to which there was no alternative in winter, there was an agreeable middle course available for at least half the year by way of Brundisium, Corinth and Ephesus. From Aulön to Corinth it was a coasting voyage, and again from Corinth to Ephesus the ship was seldom out of sight of land. The traveller, if he so preferred, could disembark at the Roman colony of Patrae (*Patras*) and pursue his journey to Corinth or Athens by road. Corinth, rebuilt by Julius Caesar as a Roman colony and capital of the province of Achaea, had recovered much of her former prosperity, and become a cosmopolitan city. The main stream of passenger traffic between Italy and Asia passed through her two ports, but, owing to the cost of transshipment, merchandise was generally sent round the Peloponnese. As Mälëa had by this time lost its terrors for experienced sailors, the projected canal through the Isthmus was not really needed; the tombstone of a manufacturer of Hierapolis in Phrygia mentions that he had rounded Mälëa seventy-two times.

Corinth and Ephesus were the two great business and commercial centres of the Aegean world; more than that, they were centres of intellectual life from which new ideas were diffused through the adjoining provinces. Hence the important part which both played in the early growth of Christianity.

From Ephesus onwards, the principal stages were Antioch on the Meander, Äpämëa, Antioch in Pisidia, Icönium, Derbe, Cybistra, Tarsus, Antioch in Syria and Caesarea in Palestine. 'Each of these', says Ramsay, 'was a knot where roads of a whole district met, and where its trade and intercommunication and education found a centre. Thus this great artery was the channel in which the life-blood of the empire mainly flowed. It was not the route along which goods mostly moved, but it was the route of those who directed trade, as well as of thoughts and inventions'.

660. (1) A very ancient trade-route from Ephesus to the Euphrates coincided with the route just described as far as Āpāmēa, where it diverged northwards and joined a similar and perhaps still older road from Sardis, continuing by way of Laodicea in Galatia and Caesarea to the Euphrates frontier. It was by this road that the red earth of Cappadocia found its way to Ephesus (Strabo, 623); heavier goods would be taken to one of the ports of the north or south coast (Amastris or Tarsus). (2) An alternative to the early part of this route, used only by travellers on horseback or on foot, ascended the Cayster valley from Ephesus and ran parallel to (1) some distance to the north, uniting with it beyond Āpāmēa. (3) An important road ran parallel to the north coast of Asia Minor from Chalcēdon on the Bosphorus and Nicōmēdia on the Propontis, through Bithynia, Paphlagonia, Pontus and Armenia. (4) These same harbours of N.W. Asia Minor were connected with central and southern Asia Minor by a road which ran south through Nicaea to Dorylaeum, whence it was possible to proceed either east to Ancyra, or south to Pisidian Antioch and the great roads running E. and W., or S.W. to Philadelphia, Sardis and Smyrna. The last named was the most important of these three roads during the first and second centuries as connecting the great ports of Ephesus and Smyrna with Bithynia. The importance of the others increased after the laying-out of the Cappadocian roads by Vespasian, and became very great indeed in the 3rd and 4th centuries, when first Nicōmēdia and then Constantinople were the seats of empire. (5) Perga, the capital of Pamphylia, and its port Attalia, communicated with Laodicea and other cities in the Lycus and Maeander valleys by a road which crossed Taurus in a north-westerly direction. In like manner, the Pontic port of Amastris on the north coast was connected by a direct road with Ancyra.

661. The Nile has always been the highway of Egypt. The emperors maintained the canal connecting its Pelusiac arm with Suez, and improved the desert-routes from Coptos to the Red Sea (§ 646) by building cisterns and rest-houses. The towns along the Nile from Alexandria to Hierasyaminos on the Ethiopian frontier (50 miles below *Korosko*) were connected by road as well as by water. A road was maintained along the desolate coast from Alexandria to Cyrene, but was probably little used except by despatch-riders, ordinary traffic going by sea. It continued westward to Carthage and thence to Caesarā; a prolongation to Tingi (Tangier) seems to have been constructed in the second century, but Tingitana was always in closer touch with Baetica than with its eastern neighbours. Remains of the Roman road-system are exceptionally abundant in the rich and populous province of Africa. Thus from Thēueste (*Tébessa*), on the central plateau, where Augustus established a legionary fortress, seven main lines radiate—east and north to the ports of Tācāpe, Hadrumētum, Carthage and Hippo Regius; north west to the ancient Numidian capital at Cirta (*Constantine*);

Other roads in  
Asia Minor.

Egypt and the  
African pro-  
vinces.



west to the later headquarters of the legion at Lambaesis; and south to the chain of frontier posts facing the Sahara. Cirta, Sitifi (*Sétif*), and in a less degree many other towns, formed similar knots in the network of communication. Even remote farms and mountain-villages were linked with their markets by skilfully engineered roads.

662. Under the Republic the despatches of provincial governors were carried by their own messengers (*tabellarii*) or orderlies (*stātōres*), or they had recourse to the staff of messengers employed by the *publicani*. The highly centralised government of Augustus brought with it a great increase of official correspondence. Provincial governors enjoyed less independence than under the Republic, and were expected to make frequent reports to the emperor, and to consult him before making any important decision. To facilitate the rapid transmission of despatches, Augustus established a regular state post (*cursus publicus*), such as had existed in the Persian Empire and in Egypt under the Ptolemies. At first the despatches were carried by relays of mounted couriers, but Augustus found it better to have them conveyed all the way by one messenger who travelled in a carriage and changed horses at frequent stages. The service thus organised was also used by officials on their journeys. Under the Republic they had enjoyed the privilege of free conveyance and entertainment (*legatio libera*), and this was sometimes extended by vote of the Senate to private travellers of senatorial rank. Under the Empire the carriages and horses of the post could only be used by persons furnished with a travelling passport (*diploma* or *euetio*) bearing the emperor's seal. Provincial governors had a number of such passports at their disposal, dated and available for a limited time (Plin. *Ep.* x 54 f), and occasionally gave one to a private traveller (*ib.* 121 f). No doubt, too, private letters were sometimes carried as a favour by official messengers. But, in principle, the imperial post was planned and maintained solely for the service of the State. Besides slaves and freedmen, soldiers of two grades were employed as messengers: (1) *speculatores* (properly 'scouts'); at Rome they were drawn from the Praetorian cohorts and furnished the emperor's body-guard; (2) *frumentarii* (properly 'supply-officers'), legionary centurions originally detached for commissariat-work, and afterwards used as despatch-bearers between the provinces and the capital; the centurion who brought St Paul to Rome probably belonged to this *corps*. The cost of transport was borne by the cities and districts through which the road passed, and the local authorities either paid a contractor, or requisitioned carriages and horses as need arose. This service, called *uehiculatio*, became a heavy burden, especially in Italy through which so much traffic converged on Rome. Nerva made the *fiscus* responsible for the postal service on the main roads of Italy, a reform which is commemorated by a coin inscribed *uehiculatione Italiae remissa*. But the provision made by the State proved inadequate, and the requisitioning of horses and carriages remained a burden which later emperors had often to relieve or adjust.

The imperial  
post.

Hadrian or one of his immediate successors organised the service by districts, generally corresponding to a province or a group of provinces, each controlled by a post-master of equestrian rank called *praefectus uehiculorum*. In command of each *mansio* (at any rate in later times) was a superintendent (*manceps*) who had under him coachmen, grooms and other subordinates, classed together in an Italian inscription as *iunctores iumentarii*. In most provinces draught-animals, furnished in fixed numbers by the town or district adjoining the post-station, were kept in readiness on the main roads; on by-roads they were requisitioned. There was an express post (*cursus uelox*), in which horses and mules were used for draught and horses for riding, and a slow post (*cursus clābūlāris*) consisting of waggons (*clābūlae angāriae*) drawn by oxen for transporting bullion, the families and baggage of officials and soldiers, and sometimes the soldiers themselves. The vehicles used in the express post were a heavy coach (*rēda*), a post chaise (*currus*), and a gig (*cisium* or *birōta*). The *rēda* could carry seven or eight, the *birōta* two passengers.

About the *cursus publicus* at sea less is known. There were post-boats (*tabellariae naues*) which plied between certain ports, such as Alexandria and Pūtēōli, and others which went wherever the service required. An inscription found at Ostia names an official responsible for mails and roving despatch-boats (*procurator pugillationis et ad naues uagas*).

The imperial post survived until the end of the Western Empire and was elaborated by the Byzantine emperors, but it always retained its strictly official character and was never opened to private correspondence or private travellers. Numerous regulations regarding it in the codes of Theodosius and Justinian show how difficult it was to control, and how fruitful in abuses.

663. From the middle of November to the middle of March navigation was practically suspended. The transport of commodities over sea, from port to port, was in the hands of ship-owners organised in corporations under the name of *naucularii marini*. Under the Republic they worked for the companies of *publicani*. Augustus did away with the intervention of these financial companies and appointed superintendents, who dealt direct with the ship-owners. In view of the importance of their function in victualling the capital, the early emperors, Claudius in particular, bestowed various privileges on the owners of merchant ships (Suet. *Claud.* 18 f), provided their vessels had a capacity of 10,000 *modii* and carried corn to Rome for six years. They were liberally paid for services rendered to the State, but were not permanently in its employ, and, in the corporations of *naucularii marini*, there was no rigid distinction between ship-owners who worked for the State and those who were solely engaged in private trade.

A change came in the third century; as the State became more dependent on them, it increased their privileges, while binding them more closely to its service. From the reign of Diocletian onwards the *naucularii*

Sea-borne  
trade.

were all servants of the State, employed in the transport of corn, oil, wood, and bullion from the provinces to Rome or Constantinople. Their ships were at the disposal of the imperial post and they were responsible to the State for the goods entrusted to them, on which they received a fixed percentage. Membership of the corporation, with all its obligations, was hereditary. On the other hand, members were exempt from almost every other burden and were allowed to engage in private trade, and their goods passed duty-free through the customs.

664. The construction of regular canals was rare in antiquity, but all the more use was made of rivers. Internal navigation was organised by corporations of merchants and barge-owners, Inland transport. associated under various names: *naucularii*, largely employed by the State to handle the yearly consignments of Egyptian corn on the Nile and Tiber: *nautae* on the rivers and lakes of North Italy, in Spain, Dacia, Moesia, and especially in Gaul and Germany, where numerous inscriptions prove their energy and wealth. The strongest of them, *splendidissimum corpus nautarum Rhodanicorum et Araricorum*, had its headquarters at Lyon (*Lugudūnum* or *Lugdūnum*). Its members navigated both the Rhone and the Saône; they also undertook transport by road from river to river; a sculptured relief set up by a *nauta Araricus* shows two men unloading bales from a waggon. In many cases the *nautae* were themselves growers, manufacturers or merchants, dealing in corn, wine, timber, woollens or pottery. Similar corporations existed at *Arĕlātē* (*Arles*) and other points on the Rhone and its tributaries, on the Loire, Seine, Rhine, Main, Neckar and Moselle. Transport across the Alpine passes was organised by a *corpus Cisalpinorum et Transalpinorum*.

665. The private letters of wealthy Romans, from the emperor downwards, were carried by their own couriers (*tabellarii* or letter-carriers, *strātōres* or grooms). In Cicero's circle such a courier would call at the houses of his master's friends, Private correspondence. inform them of his destination, and ask if they had anything to send. The *publicani* maintained a staff of messengers, and the firms which organised transport by road and river doubtless conveyed letters as well as passengers and goods. Under Nero private correspondence became dangerous and practically ceased. Under the Flavian and Antonine emperors its volume must have been very great. Galen, the court physician of Marcus Aurelius, corresponded with patients in all parts of the Empire, and received consignments of drugs from distant regions.

666. Brigands and highway-robbers (*grassatores*, *lūtrōnes*) abounded in Italy until after the civil wars. The travellers whom they Public safety. seized were not held to ransom, but sold into slavery on great estates. Augustus and Tiberius covered the country with military police-posts and gradually restored order. In the provinces many cases of robbery and murder are recorded; but, on the whole, the vast extent of the Empire seems, for the first two centuries at least, to have enjoyed a high

degree of security. Travelling at night was common, then as now, in the hot season; torches as well as arms were carried. Dio describes the audacity and resource of a famous brigand-chief, Felix Bulla, who with a band 600 strong was the terror of Italy and defied the troops of Severus for two years. Arrian wrote the life of another famous brigand, Tillibōras, who preyed on the country round Ida in the Troad (Lucian *Alex.* 2). Travelling by sea was in some respects safer than by land. Maritime commerce was long harassed by piracy in the eastern Mediterranean, which reached its height during the Mithridatic war and spread into the west. In 69 the pirates sacked and destroyed Delos. For a time, trade was suspended and Rome in danger of famine. In 67 Pompey was given extraordinary powers, and, in a brief and brilliant campaign, cleared the pirates first from the western and then from the eastern waters. Under the Empire we hardly hear of piracy in the Mediterranean until the third century after Christ; but neither the Black Sea nor the Indian Ocean was ever secure.

667. As in the East to-day, the requirements of the ordinary wayfarer were simple; he asked no more than a bare room, and often carried his own food. Humble inns (*stābūla*, *tabernae*) abounded on the main roads. In some cases a posting station took its name from a group of them (*Tres Tabernae* on the *Via Appia* in Latium, *Ad Pictas* near Rome; or from a sign-board, *Ad Gallum Gallinaceum*, 'The Cock' near Carthage, *Ad Rotam*, 'The Wheel', *Ad Dracones*, 'The Serpents'). In the pseudo-Virgilian *Cōpa*, an importunate hostess hails a passing traveller and describes the good cheer which is to be had in her shady garden. The smaller taverns (*caupōnae*), and those who kept them (*caupo*, or *cōpa*), had a bad name. Inn-keepers in general were accused of cheating and overcharging, and of watering their wine; their beds were stuffed with rushes instead of feathers; guests suffered from smoke, heat and noise, and the insolence of coachmen and ostlers. A traveller of rank avoided these discomforts. In Italy he would plan his journey so as to sleep at one of his villas, or at a friend's; Cicero owned five or six such resting-places (*diuersoria*) and speaks of buying one at Terracina, 'ne semper hospiti molestus sim' (*Ep. Fam.* vii 23). Failing this, he might sleep in his carriage, built for the purpose (*carruca dormitōria*), or in a tent, relying on his own servants, furniture and supplies. There was better accommodation in the towns, and good hotels were to be found in large commercial cities and at watering-places; but the general standard was low, because most well-to-do travellers found entertainment elsewhere. Not only the *ius hospitii*, which formed an hereditary bond between families, and its visible token the *tessera hospitālis*, but community of race or of profession, membership of a religious society or a commercial guild, served as passports to private hospitality. Officials, judges on circuit, and soldiers could claim public hospitality (*hospitium publicum*) and were billeted in private houses by the local magistrates. Travellers using the imperial post



(§ 662) would find quarters at a *mansio*. On some roads there were special lodgings (*praetōria, pālātia*) reserved for the use of the emperor and the governor of the province.

668. Private enterprise provided for the transport of private travellers. In the towns there were guilds of jobmasters (*cāsiarii*) who kept vehicles for hire (*vehicula meritoria*), and *iumentarii*, who kept horses, mules and oxen. As driving within the city walls was not permitted during the day, the stables were usually outside the gates; those who plied from a particular gate were often united in a guild. A driver might be engaged only for a single stage, or for a succession of stages (*mulio perpetuarius*). Humbler travellers rode, sometimes attended by a servant on foot. It was a mark of poverty or eccentricity to journey, as Dio Chrysostom did, on foot and unattended. Even in republican days, rich men travelled in their own comfortable carriages, with a train of servants and baggage, including furniture and plate, following in waggons. Runners (*cursores*) preceded them to clear the way. The emperors and their fashionable imitators carried luxury to excess; Nero travelled with over a thousand carriages, silver-shod mules, drivers in crimson liveries, and a host of richly attired runners. Roman travelling carriages were large and heavy, planned for comfort rather than speed, so that it was possible to read or write in them. They were drawn by teams of carefully matched mules or Gaulish ponies (*manni*); both carriages and harness were richly plated with gold and silver. Women of rank and invalids made long journeys in litters (*lecticae*).

Modes of  
travel.

669. The stream of traffic on the main roads and waterways included travellers of many different types. There were servants of the State who journeyed in the course of their duty; among them imperial messengers driving or riding at express speed; officers and civil functionaries, each with his retinue, proceeding by easy stages to a new post, which might be separated from the province where they had been serving by the whole length or breadth of the Empire; recruits for the legions and auxiliary troops making the journey to the frontier on foot. There were embassies on their way to Rome from foreign states and vassal-princes, numerous deputations bringing to the emperor compliments or petitions from distant cities; private persons going to urge some suit at court, and many others whose business was litigation or commerce. The increasingly homogeneous character of the Empire, with its facilities for travel and its unity of speech, coinage and law, induced professional men to migrate from place to place more freely than they do to-day. Doctors, teachers of philosophy and rhetoric, painters and sculptors, actors, musicians, athletes, and all kinds of craftsmen, sought a market for their skill far from their native cities. The attraction of the capital drew many of them to Rome, but foreigners and, in particular, Greeks, Syrians and Jews were numerous in all parts of the Empire. Then, as nowadays, persons of means and leisure travelled extensively; some for their health

Travellers.

to baths or healing sanctuaries; others from a desire to see the world, or from sheer restlessness. Fashionable Romans were constantly on the move from one villa to another. Young men of family were sent to Athens or to Rhodes to complete their education; thus Greece, with its rich store of historic and literary associations, became a second fatherland to which they loved to return in later life. The tour most commonly undertaken embraced Greece and Western Asia Minor, about which there grew up a considerable literature (such as the *Description of Greece* by Pausanias, written about 173 A.D., in the age of the Antonines). The great festivals, in particular the Olympian and the Isthmian, attracted vast crowds, including many foreigners. It was an antiquarian age which delighted in archaic works of art, in local traditions and the survival of old-fashioned rites. At Athens, Delphi, Ephesus and similar centres, the tourist found professional guides ready to expound the history and legends of the place and the points of interest in each building and work of art. (These local guides are invariably called ἐξηγηταὶ in Pausanias, and περιηγηταὶ in Plutarch, *De Pythiae oraculis*.) Even obscure festivals became famous, if they had some picturesque or startling piece of ritual to show, and it seems likely that some of these local celebrations, which Pausanias describes with so much detail, had been revived and embellished for the purpose of attracting tourists. The money spent by wealthy travellers in the shrunken and impoverished cities of Greece was one cause of the renewed prosperity for which there is evidence in the second century after Christ.

670. In Asia Minor the chief objects of pilgrimage were Troy, which lay on the overland-route to the East, Mytilene and Smyrna, both famous for the charm of their surroundings, Ephesus, Samos and Rhodes. Romans desirous of living in luxurious retirement often fixed their abode on one or other of the great islands off the Asiatic coast; thus Agrippa made a long sojourn in Lesbos and Tiberius in Rhodes, and Augustus, when he undertook the re-organisation of the East, established his court in Samos. The current of this tourist traffic followed the coast, and we hear little of visits even to the magnificent city of Pergamum. No inland-route could vie in beauty or interest with the cruise from Ephesus to Rhodes. The north or north-west wind, which in summer blows steadily in the Eastern Mediterranean, made it easy to continue the journey to Alexandria, making use of the cornships which touched at Rhodes on the outward voyage, to see the sights of Egypt, and return with the corn-fleet to Puteoli or Ostia. The popularity of Egypt was of much later growth than that of Greece and Asia Minor, which had been visited by many Roman travellers in the second and by still more in the first century before our era. It was not until Augustus had incorporated Egypt in the Empire, and had set up an administration on Roman lines, that they found their way in any numbers to the valley of the Nile. Thus the majority of Roman travellers followed the beaten track. Palestine

and Syria, and even so splendid a capital as Antioch, were seldom visited. Pausanias in all his travels met with no one who had seen Susa or Babylon. There were few inducements to travel in the Rhine and Danube provinces, or in Britain. In Trajan's time the only Romans in the Danube region, apart from the garrisons, were a few traders and army contractors. But the spread of Roman civilisation gradually opened up the provinces nearer home. Cicero speaks slightly of a visit to Gaul as offering neither interest nor natural beauty nor material comfort; but, under the early Empire, Southern Gaul and Southern Spain developed a high degree of prosperity, and a culture hardly distinguishable from that of Italy, which tempted restless spirits as far as Corduba and Gades. Journeys inspired by scientific curiosity were not unknown. Strabo had traversed all the eastern parts of the Empire from Armenia to Western Italy and from the Black Sea to Ethiopia; Pausanias, himself a native of Asia Minor, had visited Palestine and had stood on the shores of the Dead Sea.

671. On the other hand, voyages of discovery in the modern sense were rare in antiquity and more rare during the Roman Empire than in preceding ages. No Roman emperor sought to repeat the adventurous circumnavigation of Africa, which was accomplished about 600 B.C. at the bidding of Necho. The expedition of Demetrius of Tarsus to explore the islands beyond Britain, undertaken (if Plutarch is to be trusted) at the cost of the emperor, is a striking exception. Yet it is impossible to doubt that some of the data on which Ptolemy founded his relatively accurate account of Northern Europe, of the coasts of Arabia and India, and of the sources of the Nile, were derived from scientific travellers who took pains to compute distances and trace the course of rivers and mountain-chains. Much of his information must, however, have been derived from traders, for they, and not scientific explorers, were the real pioneers in the extension of ancient geographical knowledge.

Explorers.

Roads and Travel. Since Nicolas Bergier's *Les grands Chemins de l'Empire romaine* (1622), no comprehensive account has been written. The following should be consulted: Kiepert, *Formae Orbis Antiqui* and accompanying text; W. Goetz, *Die Verkehrswege*, Stuttgart, 1888; Sir W. M. Ramsay, *Roads and Travel* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, extra volume; Desjardins, *Géographie... de la Gaule romaine*, 3 vols. 1876-85; T. Codrington, *Roman Roads in Britain*, 1903; F. Haverfield, on *Roman Britain*, in *Cambridge Medieval History*, i (1911), ch. xiii (A), esp. p. 376 f (Roman roads and sea-communications); Caroline A. J. Skeel, *Travel in the First Century after Christ*, Cambridge, 1901; Hirschfeld, *Die römischen Meilensteine*, in *Sitzungsber. der kön. preuss. Akad.* 1907; Friedländer, *Sitten-geschichte*, vol. ii, chaps. 1 and 2.

Bibliography.

There is a handy edition of the *Peutinger Table* (§ 650 *supra*) with facsimile and letter-press by Konrad Miller, *Weltkarte des Castorius*, Ravensburg, 1888.

## VI. 11. ROMAN MEASURES AND WEIGHTS.

## A. MEASURES.

672. THE simplest and certainly the most primitive measures are those derived from the various parts of the human body. Such was the view of the ancients themselves (cf. Heron Alexandr. tab. i; Vitruvius iii 1, 5). Among primitive and practically unmixed races, where all live under the same conditions, idiosyncrasies of stature are rare, and consequently the average-sized foot will give a standard sufficiently accurate for all their purposes. When, however, people of different stocks come into contact, and different modes of life may cause differences in stature amongst the various classes of a single community, many variations of the foot or cubit will naturally be found. The growth of the arts of civilisation will require greater accuracy in measurements of various kinds; accordingly the inter-relations of various standards will be carefully ascertained by the use of some small natural object of uniform size, such as the barley-corn of the English system. Finally, with the advance of science, efforts will be made to get some more general units fixed with great accuracy and probably to bring these into relation with the measures of capacity and the standards of weight.

673. Measures of capacity were probably first obtained from natural products of a uniform size. The Hebrews and ancient Irish employed the hen's egg as their unit; at Zanzibar a small gourd is used even at the present day as a general unit, the Chinese use the joints of a bamboo in a similar fashion, and cocoa-nuts are used by the Malays for a like purpose. The Roman *cochlear* (from *cochlea*, a 'snail'), their smallest measure of capacity, and probably the *κύαθος* of the Greeks (which originally meant a gourd), indicate the like origin for standards of capacity in Italy and Greece. It is natural to expect many local variations in such measures and it is only a strong centralised government which can introduce some universal standard such as those established in England by the Act of 1824 and in China by the Mathematical Board of Peking. In Greece there are two notable instances of such legislation: Pheidon of Argos fixed the standard measures used by the Peloponnesians, and Solon fixed the Attic standards of measure and weight. On such occasions it is possible that an attempt may be made to fix certain relations between the standards of Length, Capacity, and Weight. From these considerations there is no need to suppose that either Romans or Greeks had to go to Babylonia or Egypt, as has been generally held, to obtain a foot standard.

674. It is very important to fix accurately at least one linear standard, especially the *foot*. If this can be done, the superficial and  
 Standards of length. itineray measures can also be accurately defined.



675. Of all ancient measures the Roman foot is the most important as it has been very accurately defined in four different ways:

(1) from ancient measures still extant including feet laid down on monuments and foot rules found in ruins; (2) from measurements of known distances along roads, between milestones and places; (3) from buildings and obelisks; (4) from contents of certain measures of capacity. From all these data we know the Roman foot was 296 mm., thus being almost identical with the Attic foot (295·7 mm.) and a little smaller than the English (301 mm.).

The Roman  
foot.

There was in ancient times a standard foot measure, the *pes monetalis*, which was probably lost when the Capitol was burned under Vitellius or Titus.

676. The Roman foot was subdivided in several ways: (1) the foot measure was termed the *as*, the original *as* having probably been a rod or bar of copper or bronze one foot in length. The *pes* or *as* was divided duodecimally into 12 *unciae*, 'inches'; in the case of *pes* proper these subdivisions were probably always reckoned as 'thumbs' (*pollices*, cp. Caesar *B. G.* iii 13). So in the Norse and Irish systems the foot was divided into 12 thumbs (*tonne*, *ordlach* = *pollex*).

Division of the  
foot.

*as* = 12 *unciae* (inches).

*deunx* = 11 *unciae*.

*dextans* = 10 *unciae*.

*dodrans* = 9 *unciae*.

*bes* = 8 *unciae*.

*septunx* = 7 *unciae*.

*semis* (or *semipes*) = 6 *unciae*.

*quincunx* = 5 *unciae*.

*triens* = 4 *unciae*.

*quadrans* = 3 *unciae*.

*sextans* = 2 *unciae*.

*uncia* = 1 inch.

*semuncia* =  $\frac{1}{2}$  inch.

*sicilicus* =  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch, *sescuncia* =  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches, *dupondius* = 2 feet.

(2) The *pes* was also divided into 16 *fingers* (*digiti*), a method used commonly in architecture, and possibly Greek rather than Roman in origin, though it may have been the method of the aboriginal population, whilst the duodecimal division, corresponding to the systems of Upper Europe, was that of the Umbro-Sabellian element.

677. For measuring roads the Romans used the following: 5 *pedes* = 1 *passus*, 125 *passus* = 1 *stadium* (see *stadion*, *Companion to Greek Studies*, § 487), 1000 *passus* = 1 Roman mile. It was thus nearly 95 yards shorter than the English mile.

Itinerary  
measures.

The Romans employed the *stadium* only for distances by sea, where

they simply followed the Greeks. The Romans themselves measured long distances by *milia passuum*.

678. The original unit of land measure with the Romans as elsewhere was probably not a specific number of feet, but some natural area, the length of which like that of the old English acre

Land  
measures.

would depend on the distance which oxen could drag, and a man could steer, the plough without a rest (cp. Engl. *furlong*, Gk *στᾶδιον*). The precise fact seems to be that the first natural area measure was a strip of ground of considerable length and moderate breadth, being the amount which could be ploughed in an average day's work by a yoke of oxen. Hence the Romans termed such a unit *iugum* or *iugerum*, yoke or yokeland (cp. Engl. *ploughgate*, Gk *γῆς* = both *plough* and *ploughgate*, German *Morgen*, morning's work, Fr. *journée*). The regular unit of Roman land measure was the *actus quadratus*. The *actus* originally meant the *headland*, where the plough was turned and along which the cattle were driven. This was called *actus minimus* (Varro), being only four feet wide. The length of the original furrow, that is of the patch ploughed in one day, was shortened till the furrow became equal to the breadth of the strip, i.e. the *headland* or *actus* of 120 feet. This patch, the square of the headland, became the basis of the Roman land measure. So too the Gallic *arepennis* (Fr. *arpent*), which corresponded in size to the Roman *actus*, literally means *headland*, as does also the Irish *airecenn*.

$2\frac{1}{2}$  *pedes* = 1 *gradus*.

2 *gradus* = 1 *passus*.

2 *passus* = 1 *decempeda*.

12 *decempeda* = 1 *actus*.

2 *actus* = 1 *iugerum*.

679. The most important products of ancient Italian agriculture were on the one hand wine and oil, on the other various kinds of corn. Hence naturally arose two kinds of measures, *Liquid* and *Dry*, the smaller units being common to both systems.

Measures of  
capacity.

The *cochlear*, *cochlea*, 'snail-shell' (Fr. *cuiller*, 'spoon'), or *ligula* 'spoonful', being the smallest unit, 1 *cochlear* or *ligula* = .02 of an English pint, or = 1.14 centil.; 4 *cochlearia* = 1 *cyathus* (borrowed from the Greeks); 6 *cochlearia* = 1 *acetabulum*; 2 *acetabula* = 1 *quartarius*; 2 *quartarii* = 1 *hemina*; 2 *heminae* = 1 *sextarius*. So far the measures are common, but now they diverge. *Liquid*: 12 *heminae* = 1 *congius*; 8 *congii* = 1 *cadus* or *amphora*, the large wine-jar with handles on both sides, which was the chief unit of liquid measure; 20 *amphorae* = 1 *culleus*, leathern wine-sack or tun (approximately 120 gallons). *Dry*: The Roman dry measures started from the *sextarius* = .96 pint; 8 *sextarii* = 1 *semimodius* (nearly 1 English gallon); 2 *semimodii* = 1 *modius*, the chief corn unit.

## B. WEIGHTS.

680. Man does not begin to use the balance and weights until he has learned the use of gold, this and copper being the first known of the metals. When man first barterers these metals he appraises them by measures based on the parts of the human body, a method which continues to be employed in the case of copper and iron long after the art of weighing has been invented (or borrowed), or he estimates his gold dust by certain units of capacity, e.g. the goose-quill and other units of a larger size (cf. Herod. iii 97, χοῖνιξ χρυσίου), and he finally fixes the amount of gold equivalent to different kinds of cattle, weapons, etc., by setting gold dust in a rude balance against a certain number of the natural seeds of plants, as is done at the present time by the wild tribes of Annam, who appraise their gold dust by rice grains, and are thus able to fix the equivalent values in gold for their barter series, which ranges from a small hoe (worth a rice grain weight of gold dust) up to the buffalo which is worth 288 hoes or rice grains of gold dust. As the cow was the chief unit of barter amongst the Romans and other great races of the ancient world, as it still continues to be among the Ossetes of the Caucasus and many African tribes, its value in gold became the chief metallic unit of Western Asia, Egypt, Greece and Italy, as well as other wide regions of Asia and Europe. In all systems of weight except the French Decimal system the smallest unit is some actual seed, wheat-grain, barley-corn, rice-grain, *siliqua* or *kērātion* (carat), which is the seed of the carob or St John's Bread, or the ratti (seed of the *Abrus precatoria*, commonly termed 'crab's eye') used both in India and in West Africa. The English pennyweight is based on 32 wheat-grains = 24 barley-corns, or 24 Troy grs. But as four wheat grains = three barley-corns, a relation well known to the Romans, the Troy grain is simply the barley-corn.

Origin of  
weight  
standards.

681. The Romans like the Greeks and all other peoples based their weight system on natural units, their smallest (like the Greek, cp. Theophrast. *Lap.* 46, ἐλάχιστον δὲ γίνεται κριθή) being the barley-corn.

Weights for  
gold and silver.

But the great Roman unit, which holds as important a position in ancient metrology as does the Roman foot, was the *libra* or pound. The term *libra* is not the oldest Latin name for *weight*, for *pondus* and its cognate verb *pendeo*, which literally means *to hang*, is the most primitive term. *Libra* properly means the *balance*, as is seen from the legal formula (employed in *mancipatio*) *per aes et libram*—'by means of copper and the balance'. As the name is always used in the sing. the balance was not a pair of scales, but rather the steel-yard, many specimens of which still survive, and all of which apparently belong to Roman or late Greek times. This contrivance is used not only for weighing out definite quantities of

common objects such as tobacco, cotton, etc., in the Malay States, but is employed in China for gold and silver. In the case of common products there is no shifting of the weight along the yard, but only a fixed equipoise corresponding to the ordinary unit by which each article is sold. It is not unlikely that the primitive Roman *libra* was of this character and that it only weighed one quantity, and thus in the course of time the term *libra* was transferred from the instrument to the quantity which it weighed.

682. From the fact that its chief use was to weigh *asses*, i.e. bars of copper, the mass of an *as* came to be termed the weight *par excellence*, just as the most usual amount weighed in the Greek *talanta* (pair of scales) became the *talanton par excellence*. Thus in the south of Ireland potatoes are sold by a unit (originally a measure of capacity) of 21 lbs., which consequently is termed a *weight*. But it was only with the growth of greater exactitude in commercial dealings that the art of weighing which was employed for all dealings in gold and silver was applied to copper, which had hitherto passed like the early Greek *oboloi* in bars of a given size (see Money). These bars were a foot long, and divided into 12 *unciae* or inches (see Measures). When the Romans and other Italians began to weigh copper, perhaps taught by the astute Greek traders, as the Tibetans and Malays have learned to weigh accurately from the Chinese, it was found that an inch of the old copper rod closely approximated in weight to three ox-units = 3 Gk gold staters. The old Roman ounce prior to B.C. 268 did not weigh more than 420 grs., though from that time on it became fixed at 432 grs. Thus the Roman pound before B.C. 268 contained about 5040 grs. Troy, after that time onwards about 5184 grs. Troy. So fixed was this later pound (*libra*) that the Greek metrologists used it as the standard for comparison when describing other weights such as *talents*, *minae*, etc.

683. As it is certain that in all countries the weighing of gold and the smallest weights come first in the scale, we shall begin with the lowest weights.

3 *grana hordei* (barley-corns) = 1 *siliqua*.

3 *siliquae* = 1 *obolus*.

6 *siliquae* = 1 *scriptulum*.

12 *siliquae* = 1 *semisextula*.

24 *siliquae* = 1 *sextula*.

36 *siliquae* = 1 *sicilicus*.

48 *siliquae* = 1 *duella*.

72 *siliquae* = 1 *semuncia*.

144 *siliquae* = 1 *uncia* (= 432 Troy grs. or barley-corns).

1728 *siliquae* = 1 *as* or *libra* (= 5184 Troy grs. or barley-corns).

Just as to the Greek weight system later on the *Mina* and the *Talanton* were added, when higher standards of weight were required for more bulky



commodities, so the *as* and its divisions were the higher weight units in the Roman system.

684. As the *as* was originally a bar of a foot in length and divided into 12 thumbs or inches, when copper was now weighed the subdivisions of the *as* were not only used as measures but as weights, the old *inches* becoming *ounces*.

Division of the  
libra.

*as* = *libra*.

*deunx* = 11 oz.

*dextans* = 10 oz.

*dodrans* = 9 oz.

*bes* = 8 oz.

*septunx* = 7 oz.

*semis* or *semissis* = 6 oz.

*quincunx* = 5 oz.

*triens* = 4 oz.

*quadrans* or *teruncius* = 3 oz.

*sextans* = 2 oz.

*sescuncia* or *sescunx* =  $1\frac{1}{2}$  oz.

*uncia* = 1 oz.

W. Ridgeway, *Mensura* (Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.*); *Origin of the Stadion* (*Jour. of Hell. Stud.* 1888); *Origin of Metallic Currency and Weight Standards* (1892); Hultsch, *Reliquiae Scriptorum Metrologicorum*; *Metrologie* (ed. 2, 1882).

Bibliography.

## VI. 12. ROMAN MONEY.

685. WHEREVER the cow has been domesticated, it has always been the chief unit of barter amongst primitive communities, and in terms of it the values of other commodities have been, or are still, appraised, as amongst the Zulus and many other African tribes, and amongst the Ossetes of the Caucasus. Not only amongst such peoples is there a well-defined relation between animals of different kinds, e.g. cows, sheep, goats, swine, but also between animals of the same kind, though of different ages, e.g. between a calf, a yearling, a three year old heifer, and the full-grown cow, as in the mediaeval Irish and Welsh laws. So too was it with the Homeric Achaeans, since all values, whether of slaves, silver bowls, bronze cauldrons, or arms (such as those of Glaucus), are estimated in cows, although gold was being commonly used in small pieces called *talanta* and *hemitalanta*. This Homeric *talanton* was the same as the *stater* and the Persian *daric* of classical times, the same unit being in use over all Europe and Asia as well as in Egypt, where it was termed *Cow-gold*. It was simply the value of a full-grown cow in gold weighed by

The earliest  
period.

means of natural seeds—wheat, barley, or rice. In Italy the cow was also the unit of value, whilst the same holds true for Sicily. Even in a great commercial Greek city like Syracuse, the cow formed the basis of assessment (Arist. *Oec.*, ii 21) in the reign of Dionysius (B.C. 405—367). As Italy was *par excellence* the land of cattle (*armentosissima*<sup>1</sup>), these naturally formed her chief wealth and her chief barter unit. The Romans themselves derived *pecunia* from *pecus*, ‘cattle’, and in this they were certainly right. (Cp. English *fee* from Anglo-Saxon *feoh* = ‘cattle’, and German *Vieh*, which still retains its primitive meaning. *Rupee* is likewise said to have originally meant *cattle*.) That all accounts were once kept at Rome in terms of cattle is rendered certain by the fact that, down to the time of the XII Tables and later, all fines were paid in cows and sheep. Various ancient authors prove this, and render it highly probable that when the metals came into use, the metallic unit or units, as in Greece, were based upon the older units of barter, and that just as in Greece the gold unit was based upon the value of the full-grown cow in gold (weighed by barley grains), so the Italic and Roman metallic units were based upon the old primitive units of cattle and sheep. The law known as *Lex Aternia Tarpeia* dealt with questions of penalties, and certain notices of it furnish valuable evidence. Cicero (*de Rep.* ii 60) says: ‘*gratam etiam illam legem quarto circiter et quinquagesimo anno post primos consules de multa et sacramento Sp. Tarpeius et A. Aternius consules (B.C. 455) comitiis centuriatis tulerunt*’. Gellius (xi 1, 2) tells us that ‘*idcirco postea lege Aternia constituti sunt in oues singulas aeris deni, in boues aeris centeni*’. Festus (*s.v. Peculatus*, p. 237) says: ‘*Peculatus furtum publicum dici coeptus est a pecore, quia ab eo initium eius fraudis esse coepit, siquidem ante aes aut argentum signatum ob delicta poena grauissima erat duarum ouium et xxx bouum. Eam legem sanxerunt T. Menenius Lanatus et P. Sestius Capitolinus cons., quae pecudes, postquam aere signato uti coepit P. R., Tarpeia lege cautum est ut bos centussibus, ouis decussibus aestimaretur*’.

It is thus clear that Tarpeius and Aternius fixed the number of animals to be paid in fines in B.C. 455, but did not as yet enact a money commutation, which was only made law by C. Iulius and P. Papirius, in B.C. 429, to whose *aestimatio multarum* Livy refers (iv 30). It is also plain that two well-known units of bronze in the classical period—the *centussis* (100 *asses*) and the *decussis* (10 *asses*)—were based upon the cow and the sheep, for the latter were in use as money long before so high a unit as a hundred asses or a ten *as* piece was invented.

686. In dealing with the Italian and Sicilian systems of money, we cannot take gold as the first in order of treatment, as in the case of Lydia and Greece, where that metal was the first to be coined.

In Rome, on the other hand, gold was the last of the three metals to be coined, whereas copper or bronze (copper alloyed with tin) was the first metal to be used in coinage. Moreover, as it is in copper that

Bronze  
coinage.

<sup>1</sup> Gellius, xi 1; cp. § 1 *supra*.

we shall find the closest link between the Greek, the Roman and the Sicilian systems, we must commence with that metal.

On the Italian peninsula and in Sicily we find a series of Weight and Monetary terms totally distinct from any found in Greece Proper. From this alone it may be inferred that, even before there were any Greek settlements in Magna Graecia and Sicily, there existed in those regions a well-defined system, if not of weight, at least of measurement for the exchange of copper by fixed standards of measurement. In various Sicilian cities side by side with the distinctively Greek *obols* we find small silver coins called *litrae* (λίτραι). These beyond all question are simply the representatives in silver of an ancient copper unit employed by the Sicels, a unit which they had probably brought with them into the island, or else had found there already in use amongst the Sicani. The Sicels were a tribe of the great Italic stock, being the close kinsmen of the Umbrians, and had probably formed the van of the invaders from beyond the Alps into the Peninsula (see ETHNOLOGY, § 37), and had finally crossed the Strait into Sicily and become the masters of a great part of that island.

The word *litra* is merely a dialectic form of the same original \**lidhra*, from which the Roman *libra* itself is sprung (cf. Lat. *ruber*, Gr. ἐρυθρός). The actual weight of the Roman *libra* is easily fixed, as the data are abundant, but it is otherwise with the *litra*. As copper was only coined at a comparatively late period in Sicily, and the copper and bronze coins are merely tokens or money of account, we are unable to arrive at any conclusion respecting the original full weight of the *litra* from any data afforded by the bronze coins of the various Sicilian states. Yet, from the fact that many of these coins bear marks of value, it might at first sight seem far otherwise. Thus at Agrigentum in the period preceding B.C. 415 the copper *litra* weighed about 750 grs. Troy, between B.C. 415 and 406 613 grs., and from B.C. 340—287 it was about 536 grs. only. At Himera in the period B.C. 472—415 it was about 990 grs., but within the same period it fell to 200 grs. It is futile not only to attempt any statement of the reduction of the *litra* in Sicily in general, but also to arrive at any sound approximation to its full original weight, as far as the weight of the copper coins is concerned. On the other hand, no less unsatisfactory is any calculation based on the relative values of copper and silver, owing to the great uncertainty which still prevails, Mommsen making the relation in the earlier 288 : 1, whilst Soutzo thinks that it can never have been higher than 120 : 1, a view which can be proved untenable, when the test of the value of cattle is applied, from which the ratio of 300 : 1 seems to be the most probable. According to this, the full weight of the copper *litra* was originally about 5000 grs. The *litra* was divided into twelve parts called *ungiae*, *unciae* or *onciae*, in which we recognise the Lat. *unciae*. This at once brings us face to face with the Roman copper system, where the *as* was the higher unit, and was divided into twelve *unciae*. But there are other striking coincidences. Thus  $\frac{1}{8}$  of the *as* was called *sextans*:  $\frac{1}{6}$  of the *litra* was the *hexas*

(ἐξᾶς), whilst the *triens* and the *quadrans* are paralleled by the *τριᾶς* and *τετρᾶς*, although there is a difference in the application of these terms. Five-twelfths of the *as* is *quincunx*, the same fraction of the *litra* is *πεντόγκιον*. There was thus a common Italo-Sicilian copper system, the terms of which were adopted and Graecised by the settlers in Sicily and Italy.

Naxos and Zancle and Himēra were the earliest Sicilian towns to coin money, and although Chalcidian colonies, they employed the Aeginetic standard instead of the Euboic. The silver obol had therefore a maximum of about  $16\frac{3}{4}$  grs. Now, according to Pollux (ix 80), Aristotle in his lost '*Constitution of Agrigentum*' says that the *litra* is worth an Aeginetic *obol*, and Pollux adds that 'one would find in him (Aristotle), in his *Constitution of the Himeraeans*, other names such as *ungia*, which is equal to one *chalcus*, and *hexas*=two *chalci*, and *trias*=three *chalci*, and *hemilitron* (half *litra*)=six *chalci*, and the *litra*=an *obol*'.

Aristotle thus knew that the Aeginetic obol was divided into twelve *chalci* ('coppers'). Hence the ancient Greek obol, 'spit', was a rod or spike divided into twelve parts. But, as the Attic obol was only  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the Aeginetic, it naturally had but eight *chalci*. When the Greeks settled in Sicily, they found there a copper unit exactly the same as that employed in Greece, and, when they began to coin, they found it more convenient to strike silver on a standard which corresponded accurately to the ancient unit in use in the island.

If, as is probable, silver was to copper as 300 : 1, the Aeginetic silver obol of  $16\frac{3}{4}$  grs. would be worth 5000 grs. of copper, practically the same weight as the early Roman *libra*.

There is no doubt that the Greek *obolos* was a rod of copper of a certain size; this, after the introduction of coined money (silver and gold), shrank up until the original rod was only represented, when copper was coined, by what had been its equivalent in silver or by a small copper or bronze coin, when coins of that metal were struck from the end of the fifth century B.C. The Greek coinage has preserved faint traces of the various steps in the degradation of the copper obol, but on the other hand we have seen above the Sicilian *litra* in various stages of degradation from 990 grs. down to 200 grs. Although at the Heraeum of Argos were found small bars or rods of metal, which doubtless represent the ancient obols, there is no trace in the regular Greek coinage of any survival of the bar shape. But in Sicily, at Agrigentum, there are found *litrae* which in form are distinct survivals of an earlier stage, when the *litra*, like the *obol*, was a rod or bar of copper. These coins are lumps of bronze in the shape of a tooth with a flat base; on one side is an eagle or eagle's head, on the other a crab, whilst on the base are marks of value (*tetras*, *trias*, *hexas*). The *uncia* is almond-shaped with an eagle's head on one side, a crab's claw on the other. As the ancient Chinese copper knife shrank up into a shorter and a thicker mass until at last it only survived in the familiar round coin (*cash*), so these



coins of Agrigentum show the *litra* in process of shrinkage from its original size and shape to that of an ordinary round coin of a later age.

687. The primitive copper unit of the Romans and other Italians was a rod or bar. As the cow was the highest unit in the monetary system of ancient Italy, the lowest unit was a The as. certain amount of copper or bronze called an *as*, exactly as to-day in Laos the buffalo stands at the head of the scale of currency, whilst a hoe or a piece of raw metal of a certain size stands at the bottom. In size and value the Sicilian *litra* can be identified with the ancient *obolos* or rod, and there was a very close agreement between the divisions of the *litra* and those of the *as*. The *as* was primarily a rod or bar of copper one foot in length, divided into twelve parts called *inches* (*unciae*), and it coincided with the Greek *obolos* in form as well as in its duodecimal division. The term *as*, when used in respect to metals, is never employed of either gold or silver, but is appropriated exclusively to copper and bronze. It is not the Roman unit of weight (as formerly held), for that is expressed by the general term *libra*, a word exactly corresponding to the Greek *talanton*, since it means both the *weight* and the *balance*. But the *as* is not confined to weight, but is also used as a unit of linear measure = the *foot* (*pes*) and also as the unit of *land-measure* = the *iugerum* (see § 678 *supra* for the table of sub-divisions). The use of the *as* as a *measure* is older than that as a *weight*, for weight units are constantly derived from *measures*, but not the converse, e.g., the *bushel* from the *measure* of that name. Further, as the *as* is not the unit of Roman *weight*, even if the *measure* unit was borrowed from the *weight*, the *foot* ought then to have been termed *libra* rather than *as*.

*As* is masc. in gender and appears in old Latin as *assis*. It is simply a byform of *asser*, a rod, bar, pole, which is likewise masc. Whilst one form of the word was specially confined to small rods of copper, the other was used in a wider sense. *Assis* : *asser* = *uomis* : *uomer* (ploughshare). The meaning of *assis* = 'rod' is thus closely parallel to the Greek *obolos*. That the primitive Italic *as* had the form of a rod or bar is proved by certain archaic pieces. In 1829, at Ponte di Badia near Vulci, were found quadrilaterals broken in pieces weighing from two to three pounds each, stamped with a cow and trident, and cube-shaped pieces unstamped weighing from an ounce to a pound, and also some ellipse-shaped pieces weighing for the most part two ounces. In the British Museum are some pieces of bronze which are roughly quadrilateral; two sides exhibit the marks of the mould (Fig. 25), the other two show fracture, whilst several are the end pieces of a bar, and some of them bear stamps or letters. These are pieces of short bars of bronze cut up as occasion demanded. The imprints on these pieces as well as on those from Ponte di Badia show them to be comparatively late. As the *asses* still retained their bar shape after the art of stamping metal to serve as currency had come into use, *a fortiori* the primitive *as* must certainly have been nothing more than

a plain rod or bar of copper or bronze, which passed from hand to hand, as did the ancient Greek *oboloi*, and as iron and copper and brass rods and



Fig. 25. *Aes Rude*. Ridgeway, *Origin of Metallic Currency*, p. 355.

bars pass to-day among barbaric peoples in Africa and Asia. Plutarch (*Popl.* II) translates the *libral asses* of early Rome by the Greek *obolos*. These were what were called by the Roman writers 'the raw copper' (*aes rude*) as distinguished from 'the stamped copper' (*aes signatum*) of a later date. The facts that some of the pieces from Ponte di Badia are quadrilateral and elliptical in shape, and that the pieces in the British Museum are undoubtedly parts of bars, prove that the original *as* was in the form of a bar or rod: the further fact that the cow not only appears on some of the Ponte di Badia pieces, but is also found on both the obv. and rev. of *decusses* of a brick form of the third century B.C. (Fig. 26), confirms the



Fig. 26. *Bronze Decussis*. Ridgeway, *loc. cit.*, p. 356.

statements of the ancients that cattle were the types on the oldest

*aes signatum*, and shows that the cow was the old barter unit of account, to which the metal unit was adjusted.

There is no positive evidence to show that the original monetary *as* was a foot long, but as the *as* = *pes*, it is certain that the *as* was originally a piece of copper a foot in length and of a known thickness. As soon as the rods or *asses* were exchanged by weighing, they began to lose their original form, which was only essential so long as it was necessary that they should be of certain fixed dimensions. Under the new system the shape mattered not, provided the *as* was of full weight when placed in the scale. Gaius (i 122) well describes this stage: 'For this reason bronze and the balance are employed (*i.e.* in *mancipatio*) because formerly they only employed bronze coins, and there were bars (*asses*), double bars (*dupondii*), half-bars (*semisses*), and quarters (*quadrantes*), nor was there any gold or silver coin in use, as we can learn from a law of the XII Tables, and the force and power of these coins depended not on their number, but on their weight. For, as there were bars (*asses*) of a pound weight (*librales*), there were also two pound bars (*dupondii*), whence even still the term *dupondius* is retained in use'. As *dupondius* is really a masc. adj. used as a noun, a masc. noun must be understood, but this can only be *as*. *Dupondius* therefore is simply a two-pound bar.

688. When and by whom a stamp was first placed on the bars, it is of course impossible to say. Tradition, however, seems unanimous in assigning it to the regal period. Pliny (xxxiii 43) describes the origin of his country's coinage as follows: 'King Servius first stamped bronze. Timaeus hands down the tradition that aforetime they employed it in a rough state at Rome. It was stamped with the figures of animals (*nota pecudum*), whence it was termed *pecunia*'.

Beginning of  
coinage.

689. 'Now the libral weight (of the *as*) was reduced from its full weight of a pound (*libra*) in the First Punic War, as the State could not stand the expenditure, and it was appointed that *asses* of the weight of a *sextans* (two *unciae*) should be struck. Thus there was a gain of five-sixths, and the debt was cleared off'. (*ib.* 44.) The statements of Pliny, respecting not only the bronze but also the silver and gold coinage, are substantiated by various disjointed passages of Varro and Festus. Thus Varro declares that the most ancient bronze money was cast and marked with the type of an animal (*pecore notatum*), and in another passage says that the ancient money had as its device an ox, a cow, a sheep or a swine, a statement repeated by Plutarch and other later writers. Festus states that '*aes grave* was so called from its weight, for ten *asses*, each a pound in weight, made a *denarius*, which was so named from the very number, that is, *deni*. But in the Punic War the Romans, being burdened with debt, made out of every *as* which weighed a pound (*ex singulis assibus librariis*) six *asses*, which were to have the same value as the former'. In another fragment he states that '*asses* of the weight of a *sextans* (two ounces) began to be in use from that time when, on account

Reduction of  
the *as*.

of the Second Punic War which was waged with Hannibal, the Senate decreed that out of the *asses* which were then libral (a pound in weight) should be made those of a sextans in weight, by means of which, when payments began to be made, both the Roman people would be freed from debt, and private persons to whom a debt had to be paid by the State would not suffer much loss'.

The principal facts revealed by a comparison of all the passages relating to the origin of Roman currency indicate: (1) The Romans in the regal period used *aes rude*. But, before the establishment of the Republic, they had already (according to Timaeus, *fl.* B.C. 300) begun to stamp their bronze with types of cattle (*aes signatum*, *aes grave*). (2) Some time during the First Punic War the *as* was reduced from a pound to two ounces (*sextans*). (3) In the Second Punic War the *as* was reduced from two ounces to one ounce.

A large number of *asses* and parts of *asses* have come down to us, many of them bearing marks of value. There is in them undoubted evidence of a constant reduction in the size of the *as* and its parts. Mommsen thought that it took place *per saltum* about B.C. 264, and that the *as* was then reduced to a *triens* (4 *unciae*). Soutzo holds that, from about B.C. 338, the date at which he places the first coinage of round *asses* at Rome, to B.C. 264, the degradation was a gradual process. Mommsen thus disregards the statement of the historians, that the change was from libral to sextantal *asses*, whilst Soutzo is compelled to hold that all the *asses* between B.C. 338 and B.C. 264, although they range from almost full libral weight to only 3 ounces, were treated as libral *asses*, in spite of his own doctrine that the bronze currency was always actual value for the amount represented. But there is a great variation in the weights of *asses* marked sextantal, whilst, in the interval between the First Punic War and the reduction of the *as* to the uncial standard in the Second Punic War, the same process of degradation went on without ceasing. All these facts point to the conclusion that the bronze and copper coinage at Rome was only a local token currency, as is the English silver and bronze series at the present day.

*Aes rude*, in an unstamped or unmanufactured state, was originally in use at Rome (according to Timaeus, quoted by Pliny, § 688 *supra*). This period corresponds to that time when *asses* or *bars* of given dimensions, intended to be made into articles for use or ornament, passed from hand to hand, as do the brass rods to-day in the Congo region. Then came the stamping of the *asses* towards the close of the regal period, when figures of animals were placed thereon, such figures being actually found on certain rough pieces of bronze found in Central Italy. With the use of weight instead of measure for appraising their value, the shape of the *asses* became modified, getting shorter and thicker; finally they assumed (*circa* B.C. 338) the round shape of ordinary coins and bore certain well-defined symbols on both sides. But, as few of these round *asses* are found to weigh more than



10 ounces, it would seem that the process of degradation had set in before their issue. The unit of account continued to be the *as* of *full weight* (*as libralis*). Thus all penalties due to the State were paid not in reduced *asses* of only five or four ounces but in full *libral asses* as weighed in the balance. On the other hand, although the reduced *asses* were used by the State in paying debts to private individuals, they were regarded as tokens, and no doubt the State was bound, if called upon, to pay a full pound of bronze for every stamped reduced *as* presented to it. But in ordinary times this made no practical difference, for the bronze currency was purely local over Italy and Sicily. It was far too cumbrous to be used as a means of international trade.

690. 'Under the pressure of the Hannibalic War, in the dictatorship of Q. Fabius Maximus *asses* of the weight of one *uncia* were coined, and it was enacted that the *denarius* should be exchanged for sixteen *asses*.... Nevertheless in the soldiers' pay the *denarius* was always given for ten *asses*' (Pliny, xxxiii 45).

The *as* in  
the later  
Republic.

This puts beyond doubt that the Romans used token coinage for home circulation, and that the relation between bronze and silver coinage was purely artificial. For, had not this been the case, there was no reason why the soldiers should not have been made to take the *denarius* as worth 16 *asses*. But the soldiers were serving away from Rome, and they could not force the *denarius* at the rating of 16 *asses* on non-Roman districts, without causing serious trouble.

691. But from this date the silver *sestertius* (§ 695 *infra*), which, when first struck, as its name and mark (IIS) imply, was worth  $2\frac{1}{2}$  *asses*, henceforth contained 4 *asses*.

The *sestertius*.

692. Between 160 and 110 B.C., only the lower denominations of the bronze currency were issued. In B.C. 89 by the Lex Papiria the *as* was reduced to half an ounce, and coins of that weight were struck. The bronze issue ceased completely in Rome some time between B.C. 84 and B.C. 74, and was not revived in Rome until the establishment of the Empire.

Further  
reduction.

693. Roman generals occasionally issued bronze coins with their own names—pieces of four *asses* (*sestertius*), three and two *asses*, and smaller parts of the *as*. The *sestertius* bears the mark IIS or sometimes  $\Delta$  (= 4). In B.C. 15 the Senate was permitted by Augustus to strike coins in the baser metals (brass and copper). These were marked SC and were the *sestertius* (four *asses*) (called 'first brass' by collectors), the *dupondius* = two *asses* ('second brass'), the *as* ('third brass'), and the *semis*. The last continued down to Caracalla and later under Traianus Decius. *Quadrantes* were issued down to Trajan. The *sestertius* and *dupondius* were brass, the *as* and *semis* were copper. The *sestertius* weighed an ounce.

The Empire.

694. Gaius (A.D. 37–41) reduced the *as*, and to this Statius (*Silu.* iv 9, 22) alludes: 'emptum plus minus asse Gaiano', and our actual weighings of

*asses* of his predecessor Tiberius and his successor Claudius show that Gaius reduced the *as* by 10 to 15 grs., and that Claudius restored it to its old weight. The *dupondius*, *as*, and *semiss* under Nero were for a time marked II, I, and S. Later the head of the emperor was shown radiate on the *dupondius*, and laureate or bare on the *as*. The bronze coinage proper came to an end not long before the time of Diocletian, when the silver had become so debased that it could hardly be distinguished from the bronze.

695. It was not until B.C. 268 that silver was coined at Rome. Until then the Romans had either employed silver in ingots (*lâtères aurei argenteique*, Varro) or used the coins of their neighbours, the Etruscans and the Greeks. When they had conquered Campania, overthrown Pyrrhus, and captured Tarentum (B.C. 272), they obtained silver in large quantities. The first coins with the name ROMA were issued in Campania (for types see § 704). In B.C. 268 the first silver money was issued at Rome. It consisted of the *denarius* (marked X), *quinarius* (marked V), and the *sestertius* (marked IIS). The various divisions and marks of value are the same as those used on the silver coins of Etruria from the fifth century B.C., and there can be little doubt that the Romans adopted the system from their neighbours, although the Greek coinage of Sicily had certainly also influenced them. The mark of value ceased after B.C. 88. The *denarius* weighed 70 grs. Troy, and, when issued, did not represent in actual value ten *asses librales*, but probably the reduced *asses* of the day, which did not weigh much more than a *sextans*, or at most a *quadrans*. The Romans had long been used to a bronze token currency, and the new silver was adapted to it. The *libra* and *uncia* had been well defined at Rome long before the first coinage of silver, and whilst the *sextula* ( $\frac{1}{8}$  *uncia*) was the lowest weight employed for bronze, the fourth part of a *sextula* (= the *scriptulum*) had been regularly employed in weighing gold and silver. This was probably caused by the fact that the Aeginetan obol used in Sicily was found to be about the weight of a *scriptulum* ( $\frac{1}{24}$  inch) of copper or bronze. The first Roman *denarius* weighed a *sextula* = four *scriptula* = 70 grs. The *scriptulum* and the *sestertius*, or *sestertius nummus*, were thus identical.

696. 'In the case of silver (says Varro) the term *nummi* is used; it was borrowed from the Sicilians'. As the *scriptulum* = *sestertius* = *sestertius nummus*, and as the term *nummus* was especially applied to the silver *sestertius* (cp. *sicilius* =  $\frac{1}{4}$  *uncia*, a term borrowed from Sicily, as its name shows), so the term *nummus* was also adopted from the small silver coins of Sicily called *νόμμοι* or *ρόμοι*. As the term *nummus* or *sestertius nummus* was thus especially attached to silver, the sesterce became the regular unit of account when silver had become plentiful and was coined in abundance at Rome, and it thus displaced in the later Republic the *as*, the ancient unit of account.

697. Under the stress of the Second Punic War the *denarius* was

reduced to about 60 grs., at which it continued until Nero reduced it to about 53 grs. In the same war, by the Lex Flaminia it was decreed that the *denarius* should pass for 16 *asses*, the *quinarius* for eight, and the *sestertius* for four, except in the case of the soldiers' pay, when the *denarius* was to continue to pass for 10. The mark of value on the *denarius* was changed to XVI, often in monogram. Though the weight remained unaltered for a long time, the purity of the metal was impaired. Thus Liuius Drusus, tribune of the plebs, alloyed the silver with  $\frac{1}{8}$ th of copper.

The reduction of the *denarius*.

698. In addition to the *denarius* and its divisions, there was another silver coin, called the *victoriatus* (from its type), struck in accordance with a law of Clodius, 'for previously this coin brought from Illyria was treated as bullion (*loco mercis*)'.

The *victoriatus*.

Its normal weight was about 53 grs., a standard which had been long in use in Illyria and Northern Italy, where the coins of Corcyra and Massilia were the chief currency until after the Roman conquest. The Romans issued the *victoriates* for use in those regions (cp. Livy, xli 13, 7). There was no mark of value on the *victoriatus*, but its half bore S. Its double was sometimes issued.

699. Caracalla (A.D. 211—8) introduced the *argenteus Antoninianus* (about 90 grs.), but its quality soon deteriorated. Diocletian (A.D. 284—305) restored a pure silver coinage by at least A.D. 290, if not earlier. He struck a new silver coin (really Nero's *denarius*),  $\frac{1}{96}$  of a pound, but now termed *miliarensis*, i.e.,  $\frac{1}{1000}$  of the gold pound.

Later Empire.

700. Gold, like silver down to B.C. 268, simply passed in ingots (*lātēres aurei*, Varro). It was really as a money of necessity under the stress of the Second Punic War that the Romans issued their first gold currency in B.C. 206; 'on such a standard'

The gold coinage.

(says Pliny) 'that the scruple was worth 20 sesterces, and this on the scale of the then value of the sesterce made 900 go to the pound. Afterwards it was enacted that 1040 should be coined from gold pounds, and gradually the emperors reduced the rate, most recently Nero reduced it to 45' (*aurei* to the gold pound). The first issue were pieces of 4, 3 and 2 *scriptula*, i.e. 71, 52, 35 grs. respectively. After the First Punic War, gold does not seem to have been struck until the time of the great generals and the conquest of the East. Sulla issued *aurei* at 30 to the pound (168 grs. each), and also at 36 to the pound (140 grs.). Pompey struck his on the latter standard, Julius Caesar at 40 to the pound (i.e. 126 grs. each). Those struck after Caesar's death were on the same standard, but under Augustus the weight fell to 120 grs., the normal, though not always the actual, weight, as under Nero down to Caracalla (A.D. 211—8) when it fell to about 100 grs. Macrinus tried to restore the former weight, but the 100 gr. *aureus* was struck under Elagabalus and Alexander Seuerus. Then came the period of political and monetary chaos until Diocletian (284—305) endeavoured to

put it on a better basis. Finally Constantine the Great (306–37) brought in his monetary reform in 312 and fixed the *aureus* or *solidus* (Fig. 27) at



Fig. 27. Gold Solidus of Julian II ('the Apostate'). Ridgeway, *l.c.*, p. 384.

72 grs. Troy, and so it remained until the final downfall of the Eastern Empire (1453). From it the various mintages of mediaeval and modern Europe are descended. It was divided into thirds (*tremisses*), the *solidus* being treated as a *sextula*. The *tremissis* (Fig. 28) = 24 grs. Troy = 32



Fig. 28. Gold Tremissis of Leo I. Ridgeway, *l.c.*, p. 385.

wheat grains. The barbarian conquerors of the Empire imitated the *tremissis* not only in gold but also in silver, and the *silver tremissis* became the Anglo-Saxon penny-weight (24 grs.).

701. The essence of a coin is its type, which, in the case of silver and gold especially, guarantees its purity and weight, though amongst primitive peoples it only guarantees the quality of the metal, as in Japan down to the last century. Thus in the case of the earliest known coins—those of Lydia—(Fig. 29) the devices in the incuses




Fig. 29. Lydian electrum coin.

of the oldest, the lion's head on the next series, and the forepart of a lion on the coins of Croesus (Fig. 30), were doubtless stamps guaranteeing the quality of the metal, though not necessarily the weight of the coin. The devices were probably those on the signet of the king (e.g. the lion on the



Lydian coins), or of the officials responsible for the issue. Thus Darius




Fig. 30. Coin of Croesus.

himself was the device on his own signet and on the darics issued by him (Fig. 31). Seleucus, whose signet bore an anchor, used that device on the




Fig. 31. Persian Daric.

coins which he issued as Alexander's lieutenant in Syria and afterwards as a main type on his own coins. The connexion is thus very close between the signet of a king or potentate and the device on his coins, for a coin is only a piece of metal impressed with his signet. As kings, so States place on their mintage a distinctive badge, often that cut on the public seal, *e.g.* the star Hesper, on those of the Ozolian Locri. But those State-badges were adopted for various reasons, and they often alluded to the principal product of the place used in barter before, and not unfrequently after, the invention of coinage. To such Aristotle refers when he says that 'the type is the mark of value', *e.g.* the cow on coins of Croesus, Euboea etc., the tunny at Olbia (Fig. 32), Cyzicus, and Gades, the oyster (Grynum), silphium (Cyrene), wheat-ear (Metapontum) etc. This principle applies equally to the Roman coin-types.



Fig. 32. Coins of Olbia, in the form of a tunny fish.

702. The ancients themselves state (*supra*) that the earliest stamped bronze at Rome bore figures of the cow, sheep, and swine (*pecore notati*), and they rightly derived *pecunia* from *pecus*. Such devices are well known on Italian bronze; at Rome

Types on the bronze, copper, and brass coinage.

the cow continued to be placed on oblong multiples of the *as* as late as the 3rd cent. B.C. (Fig. 26 *supra*).

703. The round *as* from its first issue (*circa* B.C. 338) bore on obv.

The *as*. a bearded Janus, on rev. a ship's beak (Figs. 33 *a*, *b*). On the

reduced *as* of the later Republic there are sometimes three ship's beaks on rev. The *triens* and *quadrans* bore a ship (Pliny, xxxiii 45).



Fig. 33 a. Roman As; Circular Aes grave.




Fig. 33 b. Reduced Roman As.

The new brass and copper coinage of the Empire regularly bore the head of the emperor (or empress or some other member of his family) on the obv., and various devices, generally referring to contemporary events, such as the emperor's victories, on rev. Thus, Vespasian after the capture of Jerusalem (A.D. 79) placed on the rev. of a *sestertius* a palm-tree with a Roman soldier and a captive Jewess, and *IUDAEA CAPTA* (Fig. 34). As the brass and copper were supposed to be under the control of the Senate, the coins regularly bore **SC** on the rev.




Fig. 34. Sestertius ('First Brass') of Vespasian.

704. Though the earliest silver was probably struck by the authority of the consuls, neither magistrates' names nor symbols appear. The Romano-Campanian coins bore on obv. a beardless Ianus' head, on rev. a *quadriga*, beneath which was ROMA. Probably Pliny refers to these coins, when he states that the earliest coins bore *bigae* and *quadrigae* (Fig. 35). On the earliest *denarii*,

Types on  
silver coins.



Fig. 35. Romano-Campanian Silver Coin.

*quinarii* and *sestertii* struck at Rome, are obv. head of Roma, with marks of value (X, V, IIS), rev. Castor and Pollux (Fig. 36). Towards the end




Fig. 36. Early Denarius.

of the 3rd century B.C. the names of the magistrates who struck the coins begin to appear in abbreviated forms, often with conjoint letters: gradually the full name appears (usually in gen. case), but the titles only appear later. There are often symbols in the field which are the badges or signets of the issuers. The type of Castor and Pollux began to be replaced not infrequently by *bigae* (cp. Pliny, xxxiii 46), whilst *quadrigae* are also not uncommon. In the second half of the 2nd century B.C. magistrates began to place on their coins types referring to their family history or their own exploits. Thus one of the Marcian *gens* placed on his coins the head of King Ancus Marcius (from whom he claimed descent) and on rev. the Marcian aqueduct built by one of the family with A, Q, V, A, M (*aqua Marcia*) in its arches (Fig. 37). Sulla placed on some of his coins three



Fig. 37. Denarius; Gens Marcia.

trophies referring to his three triumphs; Scaurus, on receiving the submission of the Nabatean king Aretas (B.C. 62 or 60), took as his type an Arab leading a camel and holding out an olive branch, with REX ARETAS (Fig. 38). The Metelli put on their coins an elephant, in allusion to



Fig. 38. Coin of Aemilius Scaurus.

the capture of the Carthaginian elephants at Panormus by one of that family. Augustus placed a sphinx, the device on his own first signet, upon coins issued by him in Asia. Later he issued coins, on the recovery from the Parthians of the standards lost by Crassus, bearing a kneeling Parthian and the recovered standards with SIGN(US) RE(CEPTUS) (Fig. 39). Thus these family and individual devices led up to the great series of com-



memorative types on the Imperial coinage. Iulius Caesar was the first to



Fig. 39. Denarius of Augustus.

place his own head on coins (Fig. 40), and though Augustus did not at



Fig. 40. Denarius of Iulius Caesar.

first follow this precedent, when his power was fully established he resumed the practice and thus began the great series of emperors' portraits on Roman coins. Besides the names of consuls, proconsuls, quaestors, praetors, aediles, who issued coins, appear also those of the *Tresviri monetales* (Commissioners of the Mint) designated commonly in inscriptions *III VIRI A A A F F* (*aeri, argento, auro flando feriundo*). These seem to have been first appointed in the Second Punic War, but did not become a permanent board until the beginning of the 1st century B.C. Besides magistrates' names and titles other inscriptions are found on coins of the Republic, usually in the case of extraordinary issues authorised by the Senate, e.g., **SC** (always on brass and copper under the Empire, not on silver); **EX SC.** (*ex Sen. Cons.*); **P E SC.** (*publice ex S. C.*), **DSS** (*de Sen. sententia*), **P** (*publice*).

705. As the gold coinage grew up under the great generals and the emperors, its types follow the same lines as those on the silver of the later Republic and the Empire, the same type being often used on both gold and silver.

Types on the gold.

W. Ridgeway, *Origin of Metallic Currency and Weight Standards* (1892); Mommsen and Blacas, *Histoire de la monnaie romaine* (1865-75); Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, ii (1884<sup>2</sup>); Babelon, *Monnaies de la République romaine* (1885-6); Cohen, *Monnaies frappées sous l'Empire romain* (1880-92<sup>2</sup>); G. F. Hill, *Handbook of Greek and Roman coins* (1899), and *Historical Roman Coins* (1909); Gneecchi, *Monete romane* (1907<sup>3</sup>; E. T. of ed. 2, Mâcon, 1903).

Bibliography.

## VI. 13, 14. WAR.

## VI. 13. THE ROMAN ARMY.

706. ACCORDING to tradition, the earliest army of Rome consisted of a mustering (*legio*) of three thousand burghers who were arranged in three regiments of 1000 each. Each regiment was under the command of a special officer (*tribunus militum*) and the whole army was commanded by the king. This body of infantry was supplemented by a cavalry corps (*equites s. celeres s. flexumines s. trossuli*). It consisted of three 'hundreds' (*centuriæ*), each century being officered by a *tribunus celerum*; a master of horse, appointed by the king, commanded the whole. The cavalry was sub-divided into 10 squadrons (*turmae*) of 30 men each, and each squadron into three bodies of ten each (*decuriæ*); each *decuria* was under the direction of a decurion. (Three more centuries were enrolled upon the admission of the *minores gentes*.) This primitive force was exclusively patrician; the clients served only as light-armed troops (*uëlites* or *arquites*). As to the tactics employed at this date we have no information; the fighting was probably of the 'man to man' character common to all primitive armies.

707. In order to increase the army, so as to meet the needs of his time, as well as to facilitate the method of enrolment, Servius Tullius effected an entirely new division of the community. To the original tribes he added four, so as to embrace not merely the patricians, but all citizens who had a property stake in the State (*locupletes* or *assidui*). This increased body was then graded according to age into *Iuniores* (all able-bodied citizens between 17 and 46) and *Seniores* (from 47 to 60). Next, five *classes* were distinguished on a property census, which decreased from 100,000 *asses sextantarii* for the first class to 11,000 (or 12,500 according to Dionysius) for the fifth. The first class furnished 80 centuries, 40 of *Iuniores* and 40 of *Seniores*. The second, third and fourth classes provided 20 centuries each, while the fifth class amounted to 30 centuries. There was the same proportion of *Iuniores* and *Seniores* as in the first class. From the mass of citizens whose census fell below the standard of the fifth class were drawn five centuries, four being composed of artisans from the trade-guilds; of these two centuries were composed of carpenters and smiths (*fabri tignarii* and *aerarii*) and two centuries of horn-blowers (*cornicines*) and trumpeters (*tibicines*). The fifth century was composed of unarmed supernumeraries (*accensi uelati*) who filled the places of the killed and disabled, and acted as pioneers or scouts. The general body of poorer folk (*proletarii*) were called upon only in cases of grave emergency.

708. These changes were accompanied by important changes in equipment and tactics. Each class differed in equipment. The first class were completely armed with helmet (*galea*), cuirass (*lōrica*), greaves (*ocreae*), and a round Etruscan shield (*clipeus*); their offensive arms were a sword (*gladius*) and the *hasta* (a long spear, which, at the period under consideration, was capable of being employed as a missile weapon). The second class had no cuirass; their shield, moreover, seems to have differed in type from that of the first class. The third class were armed like the second, except that they did not wear greaves. The fourth class were armed with the *hasta* and a light javelin (*uerrūtum*); the fifth class were provided only with slings and stones; neither of the two lowest classes had any defensive armour.

Armour.

At the same time the cavalry was increased to 18 centuries. These were drawn from the richest of the citizens, though there is no information as to what the census standard was. Each horseman received a State grant to purchase a horse or rather two horses (*aes equestre* or *pararium*) as well as a sum for its keep (*aes hordearium*). During the siege of Veii, a number of wealthy citizens volunteered to serve as cavalry and provide their own mounts. Thus there arose beside the 18 centuries of *equites equo publico* a body of *equites equo privato*.

709. The foot soldiers were the chief strength of the Servian army. They formed four legions, two of *Iuniores*, and two of *Seniores*. The latter formed a *Landwehr*, a garrison force which took the field only in emergencies. In each legion were twenty centuries of the first class, five centuries each of the second, third and fourth classes, and seven centuries of the fifth class. The first three classes fought in a formation similar to the Dorian phalanx. With a frontage of five hundred men and a depth of six ranks, it must have had great thrusting power, but must have lacked flexibility. To some extent this drawback was met by the centuries of the two lowest classes, which fought alongside as light-armed troops (*rorarii s. ferentarii*), and by a complement of horsemen, 300 being allotted to each legion. But Roman cavalry and Roman light-armed troops were never very effective forces. Roman generals learnt to rely less and less on such arms and to endeavour to supply their place by making the legion a more flexible and more homogeneous corps.

The Servian phalanx.

710. The history of the transition from the Servian phalanx to the manipular system is obscure. The latter was probably the outcome of the difficult mountain warfare against the Samnites, and of the experience of the rushing tactics of the Celts. According to Livy, whose description is not very clear (viii 8), it was employed in 340 B.C. It was fully developed in the campaigns against Pyrrhus. Obviously, for any but parallel engagements, the Servian phalanx was disastrously cumbrous. Associated with the change in organisation were some important innovations. A glaring fault of the Servian system was the assumption that the richer citizen, who would be naturally the better

The manipular system.

equipped, would also be the most efficient soldier. Hitherto, a legionary's expenses were defrayed by himself or his tribe; but, owing to the protracted fighting at Veii in 406 B.C., the State relieved the citizen of a burden which was pressing too severely on the poorer soldiers, who thus to some extent were placed on a level with their richer fellows. The *pilum*, a six-foot javelin with iron extending half its length, replaced the *hasta*, which was found to be a poor weapon against the sweeping blows of the Gallic long-sword. Probably at the same time, the sword was shortened and made more suitable for stabbing than cutting. Details concerning these changes are wanting, nor do we obtain explicit information until the end of the 3rd century, when Polybius, himself an expert in military matters, becomes our chief informant.

711. The legion was reorganised so as to admit of greater flexibility and ease in manœuvring; at the same time it was found desirable that there should be a military unit of sufficient strength to act in partial isolation from its fellow units. This new unit was the maniple, composed of two centuries, though that term no longer implies that these bodies consisted of 100 men. The normal strength of the legion at this date consisted of 4200 men, divided into 1200 *uēlites* (light-armed troops, the youngest and poorest citizens), 1200 *hastati* (older and richer than the *uelites*), 1200 *principes* (the most vigorous in years) and 600 *triarii* (the oldest and most experienced). The number of the *triarii* was constant; in legions of greater strength, the additional troops were distributed between the first three classes. Each of the three heavy-armed classes was divided into ten maniples and twenty centuries, so that the normal century of the *hastati* and *principes* was 60 men, while that of the *triarii* was only 30. 20 *uelites* were attached to each of these 60 centuries. Authorities differ regarding the exact arrangement of the maniple in the field, some holding that the ranks were 4, others 8 or 10 deep. It is not unlikely that the commander exercised his discretion on this point, and that the number of ranks differed on different occasions. Before an engagement, the three classes were drawn up behind one another, so that the intervals between the maniples of the front class were covered by the maniples of the rear, an arrangement styled the *Quincunx* (but see § 733).

712. The *hastati* and *principes* had two *pila* for throwing, while the *triarii* retained the old *hasta*, which they used as a thrusting weapon. Battle was opened by the *uelites*, who advanced from the rear of their maniples and hurled their missiles; as the armies closed, the *hastati* hurled their *pila* at a distance of three to five yards, and then engaged with the sword. If the *hastati* were worsted, the *principes* advanced. The *triarii* were the last reserve; sometimes they were kept behind to guard the camp. That this arrangement was the result of a gradual series of changes is shown by the nomenclature, which even to Varro (*L. L.* v 89) was obscure. The *triarii*, who were also styled *pilani*, did not carry a *pilum* but a *hasta*, while the

Army of the  
2nd century.



*hastati* were armed with the *pilum*. The *principes*, in spite of their name, formed the second line and not the front line.

713. The legionary complement of cavalry remained 300, in ten squadrons of 30 men each. They fought on the flanks, charging in close order, three deep, though occasionally they fought in extended order or even on foot. Roman cavalry, as observed above (§ 709), was never very efficient, and, for this arm, the State had to depend more and more on its allies. Roman cavalry, in fact, as a field-force, ceased to exist before the first century B.C. Its last appearance was in Spain in 140 B.C., when it made a sorry exhibition. Italian cavalry was not employed after the Social War. Henceforward in Roman armies large contingents of foreign mercenaries, Gauls, Spaniards, Africans, and Thracians, fill this position, the proportion of cavalry to infantry varying from a fourth to a fifth. Sometimes other expedients were employed; in 211 B.C. we find a kind of mounted infantry. *Velites*, armed with a buckler (*parma*) and javelins (*hastae uelutares*), rode behind the horsemen, and leaped down to discharge their missiles in volleys.

Roman  
cavalry of the  
Republic.

714. As the dominion of Rome was enlarged by successive campaigns, its armies ceased to exhibit an exclusively burgher character. Latin communities in early days supported independent contingents and Latin generals shared the command of the united forces alternately with the Roman generals. After 338 B.C., the majority of the Latin communities furnished contingents which were enrolled in the legions. Finally, after the Second Punic War, independent municipal legions ceased to exist, although the other kinds of States, the *ciuitates foederatae* and *coloniae*, still furnished separate bodies of troops, the quota to be supplied by each being fixed by the consul, while the States themselves enrolled the troops and provided a leader and paymaster. Their commissariat during the campaign was supplied by the Republic. The quota of such troops serving with a consular army of two legions amounted usually to 10,000 foot and 1800 cavalry. The foot were divided into twenty corps (*cohortes*), and the cavalry into thirty squadrons. These troops included corps of picked men (*extraordinarii*), the infantry forming four cohorts of 400 each, and the cavalry ten squadrons of sixty each. In battle the allies were as a rule placed on the wings, hence the terms *cohortes alariae*, *equites alarii*. The supreme command of such allies was vested in six Roman officers (*praefecti sociorum*) appointed by the consul.

Auxiliary  
forces under  
the Republic:  
socii and  
auxiliares.

715. The *auxiliares* must be distinguished from the allies proper (*socii nomenque Latinum*). The former were foreign mercenaries in the pay of the State. They were chiefly cavalry, in which arm the Roman armies were notoriously weak (§ 713). The custom of employing such troops dates from the Second Punic War. At the Ticinus in 218 B.C. Scipio employed a body of Gallic horse. This system at times proved dangerous. Caesar, for example, found that he could place little reliance on Gallic cavalry when

fighting against their fellow-countrymen; thus, when he was obliged to take cavalry on his way to meet Ariovistus, he elected to mount legionaries on the horses of his Gallic troops. Besides cavalry, there were contingents of a special character such as Balearic slingers, Mauretanian darters, and archers from Crete, such as fought at Trasimene. After the Social War, the *socii* disappear as a distinct force, and the infantry henceforward consisted solely of legionaries and *auxiliares*, to whom the terms *alarii*, *cohortes alariae* were now applied. These latter, as a rule, retained their national arms and equipment.

716. Political and social conditions led to a complete reorganisation of the army in the first century B.C. The older systems were based on a property qualification, and military service was compulsory. But, in the first century B.C., the old middle class had decreased enormously; the census tells a startling tale. In 265 B.C., the number of burgesses is recorded as 382,000. 129 years later it had decreased by nearly 75,000, and the shrinkage persisted. Service was, moreover, becoming irksome to the wealthy citizen; nor did the attempts to make it popular, by shortening the term of service (133 B.C.), or providing clothing for the soldier at the expense of the State, meet with much success. From time to time the field of recruiting had to be enlarged by lowering the census-standard; in Polybius' day it was reduced to 4000 *asses*; immediately preceding the Marian reforms, it seems to have stood at 375. Now also, owing to the length of the campaigns which the State undertook, a class of professional soldier was arising, who found in a military life a congenial and profitable occupation. To such, when their years of service had expired, exemption was anything but welcome. They deserted the colonies to which they had been sent, they offered their services as volunteers when a profitable campaign was on foot, as in 190 B.C. and 171 B.C. As early as 342 B.C., a meeting of the army at Capua led to the law that no soldier could be struck off the roll of service against his will. Thus we have a curious condition of things:—a small class of wealthy citizens who were legally bound to serve, and detested service, and an increasingly large body of men who desired to serve, but were excluded either by poverty or age. The fighting machine of Rome had to be reconstructed; this reconstruction was hastened and the ground cleared for it by the annihilation of the five Roman armies in 106 B.C.

717. It was to Marius that the State owed the creation of an army which was adapted to the conditions of the day. It was due to his political tact that the first mercenary army of Rome was enrolled by voluntary enlistment, not by conscription. Free birth was the only qualification. An army so raised and constituted would differ naturally in sentiment and character from those of the early Republic. Not to the State but to their general did they owe their reverence and loyalty. No longer was the soldier dismissed at the end of a campaign. Enlisting normally for twenty years, he entered on a career of successive advance-

The mercenary army.

Marius.

ment, and his interests were confined to his profession. For such men a more scientific discipline and training was needed; these were introduced by P. Rutilius Rufus (105 B.C.) on the model of the training in the gladiatorial schools. All soldiers being now equal in condition, the old classes of *hastati*, *principes*, *triarii* disappeared and all legionaries bore the same equipment. The cohort<sup>1</sup>, a combination of three maniples, became the military unit. The number of cohorts in the legion was always the same, ten. The legion averaged 6000 men, though it often fell as low as 3000. The *hasta* was discarded and the *pilum* was carried by all. The eagle (silver, and later, gold) became the standard of the legion, and was borne by the first maniple of the first cohort; in camp, it was kept in a shrine next the head-quarters (*prætorium*, § 736) and regarded as the tutelary providence of the troops, often offering an *asylum* to military offenders. From this period onwards the legionary number began to have a permanent significance; hitherto it had indicated merely the order of enlistment and ceased with disbanding.

718. Julius Caesar did much to perfect the system designed by his great uncle. He laid stress on efficiency, not numbers. Recruits were not immediately incorporated into his legions. It was only after long trial and schooling in garrison and outpost duties that he ventured to employ them in a pitched battle. This will explain the fact that his legions often numbered little more than 3000 men. Under him, as under Marius, large numbers of time-expired soldiers (*evocati*, § 722) served voluntarily on their general's invitation and enjoyed special pay and privileges. It was to these and to their centurions that he trusted most for the efficiency of his armies. His most valued officers were no longer the *tribuni militum*, but the *legati* (§ 751). Caesar.

719. The military reforms of the first century B.C. widened the gulf between the citizen and the soldier. The soldier learnt to owe allegiance to the man who led and fed him, his affections were centred on the only home which he knew—the camp. *Esprit de corps* was taking the place of patriotism. The class of recruit changed and, on the whole, for the worse. More and more the Italian yeoman, now a diminishing class, was excluded from the legion till, under the Empire, if such a man desired a military career, he was forced to seek it in special battalions outside the legion (§ 724). The legion was tending to become a close guild. The final form of the Roman military system was due to Augustus, who created the standing army. After Actium, he disbanded a large number of the legions then enrolled. Theoretically, the remaining legions were still re-enlisted every year, though the same soldiers served continuously. But, in 16 B.C., the army was placed on a new basis. The terms of service were fixed at 16 successive years for the The standing army of the Empire.

<sup>1</sup> This legionary cohort is to be distinguished from the general's bodyguard (*cohors prætoriana*) and from the *cohors alaris* (§ 715) as well as from the *cohors auxiliaris* (§§ 715, 723) and the different city-cohorts of imperial times.

legionaries and 12 years for the guards (§ 728). In 3 A.D. the German War forced the *Princeps* to enroll eight additional legions (XIII—XX). In 5 A.D., the terms of service were increased to 20 years for the legions, and 16 years for the guards. At the end of this period, a soldier would receive a reward in money instead of a grant of land, which had been the rule in the previous half-century. By the defeat of Varus, 9 A.D., three legions (XVII—XIX) were wiped out, and two legions (XXI, XXII) were enrolled in their place. The supreme military control was retained by the emperor, who appointed all the principal officers (§ 751).

720. Each legion was now a permanent corporation with its own traditions and history, resembling in some respects the guild (*collegium*), which is such a marked feature in the social life of the Empire. It was distinguished from its fellow-legions by a number and title. When Augustus, after Actium, retained six of the legions of Lepidus and Antony, and 12 of his own, he did not alter the numbers which these had borne in their original armies. This precedent made the legionary title a necessity, for two, three or even four legions could bear the same number, e.g. III *Gallica*, III *Augusta*, III *Italica*, III *Parthica*. In some cases the title indicated the combination of two legions into one (*Gemina*) or conversely the splitting of one legion into two, the part which retained the original eagle being designated *Primigenia*. The place also of the military *dépot*, the tutelary deity of the *corps*, the scene of a great campaign, special legionary *insignia* (e.g. V *Alauda*), or some act of military courage, gave the legion its special title. The imperial title *Augusta* and the name of the emperor who founded the legion were borne, generally accompanied by some term expressive of the regiments' loyalty or bravery (*pia*, *fidelis*, *fortis*). Caracalla instituted the practice of giving the name of the reigning emperor to nearly all the legions.

Augustus reduced the number of the legions; at the time of his death they amounted to 25. His successors added from time to time to this number. Under Septimius Severus there were 33. Augustus' military economy, suitable as it may have been to the requirements of his day, formed an unfortunate precedent for his successors. Again and again the number of troops proved insufficient for the demands of the Empire.

721. Under the Empire the normal size of the legion was 5600 men in 10 cohorts. The first cohort was especially strong; it consisted of 1000 men in 5 centuries, the first century being composed of 400, the second of 200, the third and fourth each of 150, and the fifth of 100 men. The remaining 9 cohorts were *quingenariae*, i.e. they had each roughly 500 men in 6 centuries. The military conditions of the Empire led to three important innovations. Marius and Caesar had completely detached the cavalry from the legions. The army under the Empire was a standing one (στρατιῶται ἀθάνατοι) quartered in fixed districts and provinces, each

Changes in the  
legion under  
the Empire.



legion or group of legions having definite garrison or police duties to perform. Hence a return was made to the earlier practice of attaching a cavalry complement to each legion (§ 713). A standing army required commanders whose office was permanent. The precedent of Iulius Caesar led to the creation of such officers in the legates (*legati legionum*, *legati Augusti*), who were always men of senatorial rank. Finally, the permanent camps of the imperial legions led to the institution of a new class of officers, the *præfecti castrorum*.

722. In connexion with the legions may be noticed three special classes of soldiers, the *euocati Augusti*, the *uexillarii*, the *frumentarii*.

Under the Republic, as early as the days of Flamininus, it had not been unusual for generals to invite desirable volunteers to serve under them. Such men were called *euocati*; they were not properly soldiers, but *pro militibus*. They served apart from the legion, and enjoyed special privileges and rewards. Under the Empire, the term *euocati* had a different meaning; the men who now renewed service were experts in special branches of military economy; their duties were clerical and technical rather than purely military. They were, for example, attached to the commissariat, clerks of the military court, engineers and surveyors. The privilege of *euocatio* was apparently confined to the Urban cohorts (§ 730) and the praetorians (§ 728), from which veterans could be detailed to serve in the above-mentioned capacities with the various legions. The *euocatus* ranked next the centurion in dignity, and like that officer carried the vine staff (§ 752). The *uexillarii* formed a *corps d'élite*, resembling the *euocati* of the republican armies, a nucleus of experienced campaigners who strengthened materially the fighting power of a legion. They were veterans who, even after their discharge (*exauctorati*), elected to pursue a military life. They ceased to be under the regular standard (*signum*), but served under a special ensign (*uexillum*): hence their name. They were exempt from the ordinary duties of the soldiers and reserved as a fighting force. *Vexillarius* in this sense is to be distinguished from other meanings of the same term. *Vexillum*, *uexillatio*, *uexillarii* was applied to any detachment from the main body dispatched under a centurion or higher officer to perform some special service. Towards the end of the third century, the term *uexillatio* takes a further meaning, viz. a regular troop of cavalry. The *frumentarii* date from the reign of Hadrian. From their headquarters at Rome and Ostia, detachments (*numeri*) were detailed to serve with the different legions. Originally, their duties were confined to the corn-supply which was required for the military commissariat. But these functions were enlarged; they discharged postal duties, acted as military police and warders, as well as filling the rôle of a modern secret police. They were a purely military body, and each detachment was regarded as belonging to a particular legion, though it was not necessary that it should serve with the legion whose name it bore.

*Euocati* ;  
*uexillarii* ;  
*frumentarii*.

**723.** Augustus' reduction of the legionary forces was accompanied by the reorganisation of the auxiliary forces. These latter provided all the cavalry and a large proportion of the infantry under the Empire. Part of this infantry was equipped like the legionaries; but a considerable portion adhered to their natural weapons and dress; such were styled *sagittarii* (archers), *funditores* (slingers), *contarii* (spearmen), etc. Some were armed with broadswords (*spāthae*) and thrusting-spears, in contrast with the legionary's stabbing sword and heavy javelin. These were brigaded with the legions in numbers generally equal to that of the regulars. Their cohorts (*cohortes auxiliares*) were distinguished by their numbers and their constitution (*milliariae*, *quingenariae*, and *peditatae*, *equitatae*). The *milliariae* consisted of 1000 men in 10 centuries, the *quingenariae* of 480 in 6 centuries. If the cohort consisted of infantry solely, it was styled *peditata*; but many cohorts consisted of a mixed body of horse and foot, and such were styled *equitatae*. Some of the less important provinces were garrisoned solely by such troops.

**724.** On the same standing with these auxiliary cohorts were a special class of troops styled *cohortes civium Romanorum, voluntariorum, ingenuorum*. When the regular levy ceased under the Empire, Italians were practically excluded from legionary service (for no legion was now quartered in Italy). If they could not, or would not, enlist in the *corps* of praetorian cohorts (§ 728), the only alternative open to them was to serve in the auxiliary cohorts or as volunteers; hence the formation of these cohorts of volunteers. They may have originated in the cohorts of freedmen which Augustus enrolled, but in later days they did not by any means consist solely of this class.

**725.** Besides these organised auxiliaries, there was in certain districts a kind of provincial militia, maintained by the natives; its rôle was chiefly that of police for the suppression of bandits and pirates. In Hispania Tarraconensis the *praefectus orae maritimae* had two cohorts of this class under him. In cases of grave emergency, moreover, the youth of a province could be enrolled as a *Landsturm*, as was the case in Cappadocia during the reign of Claudius.

**726.** The cavalry of the Empire was exclusively auxiliary. It was divided into two classes, *alae milliariae* consisting of 24 squadrons of 40 each, and *alae quingenariae* which had 16 squadrons of 30 each. These cavalry battalions differed greatly in equipment, the majority bearing their national accoutrements. As has been mentioned above (§ 721), each legion again possessed a cavalry contingent. In Hadrian's time this legionary cavalry (*equites legionis*) consisted of four squadrons for each legion. This quota was afterwards increased, and each legionary cohort had its own detachment, the first cohort having four, and each of the remaining nine cohorts, two squadrons. Each squadron consisted of 30 men under three officers (*decurio*, *duplicarius*, *sesquipedarius*).

Auxiliary  
forces under  
the Empire;  
cohortes  
auxiliares.

Cohortes  
civium.

Provincial  
forces.

Cavalry.

Corresponding to the *extraordinarii* of earlier days (§ 714) there were picked *corps* of horse and foot (*equites*, *pedites singulares*).

Singulares.

727. Some of the auxiliary *alae* and cohorts bore titles like the legions, while cohorts and *alae* of the same division were further distinguished by numbers, e.g. *coh. II Aug. Cyrenaica*, *ala I Thracum Germanica*. Roman citizenship was often given as a reward to those auxiliaries who did not possess it. When Caracalla extended this privilege to all provincials, the few troops in the armies who did not possess it were the foreign mercenaries (*numeri*, *nationes*).

728. Under the Republic, it was usual for a general to be attended in the field by his friends and clients, who acted as his bodyguard. Such a body was called his *cohors praetoria*, and the practice dates from the time of Scipio Aemilianus. Towards the close of the Republic, these bodyguards ceased to consist of friends and dependents; generally *evocati* (§§ 718, 722) and *equites extraordinarii* (§ 714) served in this capacity. At the same time, it became usual for generals to have several of these *corps* of guards. At Actium, Octavian had five. Such were the precursors of the famous praetorian cohorts, who played so momentous a rôle in the history of the Empire. Since the Princesps was supreme head of the army, the headquarters (*praetorium*) of the whole service would be wherever he was. Under Augustus, no legions were left in Italy. For the protection of that country he trusted to his colonies of veterans, and to his praetorian cohorts, which he placed on a new footing. He formed nine cohorts, three of which he stationed at Rome, distributing the rest over different parts of Italy which he was wont to visit. Under Tiberius, all the cohorts were concentrated in one camp at the Viminal gate. Each of these cohorts consisted of 1000 men in ten centuries: to each century a squadron of cavalry was attached, i.e. the cohorts were *milliariae equitatae*. They were recruited exclusively from Italians and from a few Romanised provinces. Vitellius violated this rule by forming cohorts from his Germanic legionaries, but Vespasian restored the old principle. Septimius Seuerus, when he stationed legions in Italy, recruited the praetorians from their ranks, so that these ranks were filled by promoted barbarians, and this practice continued until Constantine disbanded the *corps*. The command of these troops was generally entrusted to two officers of equestrian rank (*praefecti praetorio*); the experiment of a single commander proved too dangerous, especially in the case of Seianus; Vespasian appointed his son sole prefect, while Commodus instituted the practice of appointing three prefects. Each cohort was commanded by a tribune, and the chief centurions (*trecentarii*) of the different cohorts held equal rank with one another. The praetorians received double pay (2 *denarii* daily); their uniform was particularly splendid; their term of service was sixteen years. The part these troops played in history was political rather than military; yet, as fighters, they showed themselves capable,

The guards;  
cohors  
praetoria.

noticeably in the year of the Four Emperors and in the Marcomannic Wars of Aurelius.

**729.** In spite of the preeminent position of the praetorians, they were distrusted by the emperors. Augustus employed a special bodyguard of Germans or Batavians, a practice similar to the institution of the Swiss guards by French monarchs. These guards were legally slaves; therefore this body was not styled a cohort but a guild (*collegium*). They were disbanded by Galba, and under later emperors their place was filled by the *equites singulares Augusti* (to be distinguished from the *equites singulares* of § 726). They were soldiers promoted from the cavalry of the Rhenish and Danubian provinces; they were stationed in two camps at Rome, and accompanied the emperor when he took the field; their helmets were unplumed and their uniform generally was less imposing than that of the praetorians.

**730.** There were also several centuries of imperial orderlies, under the command of the praetorian prefects. These men (*statores Augusti*) were reserved for the special service of the emperor.

Besides the praetorians, there were two other important city brigades, the *cohortes urbanae* and the *uigiles*, both established by Augustus. The former, under the command of the city-prefect, formed the garrison of the capital. Under Tiberius, they formed four cohorts, one being stationed at Lyons. Claudius added two cohorts to serve at Puteoli and Ostia, and Vespasian despatched a cohort to serve at Carthage. These troops ranked immediately after the praetorians and their cohortal numbers rose in sequence to those of that brigade, viz. X, XI, XII, XIII. Vespasian's new cohort, however, was designated *cohors I urbana*. The *cohortes uigilum*, though theoretically part of the regular army, discharged only the duties of police and of a fire-brigade. They consisted of seven cohorts, recruited from freedmen, who found in this way a method of entering the army. Later, three years' service in this arm qualified a freedman for full citizenship.

## WEAPONS AND TACTICS.

**731.** The Romans learnt much regarding equipment and weapons from their enemies. The shield of the legionary was a copy of that of the Samnites, rectangular, leathern, rimmed top and bottom with iron, about 4 feet by 2½. It was cylindrical, so as to cover the body, and it generally had in the centre a large boss of iron or bronze (*umbo*). In 340 B.C. this had completely displaced the earlier round shield of iron (*clipeus*) which they had adopted from the Etruscans. Similarly, after the Second Punic War, the so-called Spanish sword (*gladius*) was adopted as the chief offensive weapon of the legion. It was two-edged,



heavy yet handy, suited for stabbing rather than cutting. The blade varied from 20 to 24 inches in length. It was worn on the right side, sometimes from a baldric (*baltus*), but more often fastened to the belt (*cingulum*) of leather, plated with metal. On the left side a dagger was usually worn. The body of the legionary was protected by a leather doublet, the waist and shoulder pieces being composed of strips so as to permit free movement. With the better-equipped soldiers these strips were plated with metal (*lōrica segmentata*). The poorer soldiers wore a metal disc (*pectorale*) to protect the right shoulder which the shield did not cover. Harness of ring-work (*lorica hamata*) and of small metal plates (*l. squamata*) was also worn. The solid iron breastplate went early out of fashion, though it was still worn by officers. Underneath the cuirass was worn a close-fitting woollen tunic, which reached nearly to the knees. The feet were shod with hob-nailed sandals (*cālīgæ*) fastened with numerous thongs. Under the Republic, the legionary wore a greave (*ocrea*) on his right leg; but, in imperial days, greaves seem to have been worn only by the centurions, officers and guards. The legs of the legionary were naked until the rigours of northern climates compelled the troops to adopt the trews (*brācæ*) of the Gauls and Germans; sometimes leg-bandages (*fasciæ*) were used instead. After the time of Camillus, the leather helmet (*galea*) was renounced by the heavy-armed foot-soldier in favour of the metal *cassis*. This was of the Greek type, with metal 'comb' and brow and cheek pieces (*hūcūlæ*). Sometimes there was an ombril. Comb-helmets ceased to be the rule in imperial days, except with officers and guards. When a crest or plume of horse-hair was worn, it was donned only on the eve of an engagement. As a distinguishing mark, the 'combs' of the centurions ran transversely (from ear to ear) across the crown of the helmet. On the march a soldier carried his helmet swinging from a strap on his breast. He cut his hair short and shaved clean. The standard-bearers as a rule wore the skin of a wolf or of some other wild animal instead of a helmet (Fig. 46). Each legionary carried two javelins (*pila*). These weapons displaced the earlier thrusting-spear (*hasta*), and could be used equally for thrusting and for throwing. The total length of the *pilum* was nearly 7 feet, of which the iron head formed at least one-third. Marius is credited with improving the method of fastening the shaft to the head, using a pin of wood on one side and a pin of iron on the other. The result was that, after a discharge, the weapon could not be plucked out and hurled back, because the head became detached. Caesar attained the same object by making all the head, save the point, of soft iron, so that the weapon bent on impact. At the battle of Bibracte (§ 734) the Helvetii were compelled to cast away their shields because they could not detach the *pila* lodged in them. When, under Hadrian, a return was made to the phalanx attack (§ 733), a long thrusting-spear (*lancea*) was introduced. The soldier's equipment was completed by a cloak (*sāgum*), first square, then round, reaching to the knees, brownish red for the private, white for the officers, fastened

on the shoulder or under the chin by laces or a brooch. The early legionary cavalry were equipped with a leather corslet, iron helmet, and a light round shield (*parma*) of iron or leather rimmed with iron. They carried a thrusting lance (*hasta*) as well as javelins (*vērūta*) and sword. They rode on two blankets, the inner one of felt or leather, fastened by a surcingle, breast-strap and crupper. There were no stirrups, and, except in mountainous countries, the horses were unshod. Under the Empire the cavalry (which was now entirely auxiliary) exhibit a great variety in equipment; they generally wore cuirasses of leather or of ring-mail, and were armed with a lance (*contus*) and long sword (*spātha*). Often they wore no helmet. Under Hadrian, there was a special equipment for sham fights; the cavalry




Fig. 41. Roman legionary.

From the monument of C. Valerius Crispus, of legion VIII, now in the Wiesbaden Museum. He is here represented wearing a metal helmet adorned with a *crista*, a *foçale* round his neck, a leather doublet with leather shoulder-pieces, a metal-plated belt, a sword hanging from a strap thrown over the left shoulder, short *brācae*, and light *caligae* leaving the toes bare. The left hand holds the *scutum* and the right the *pilum*. (From Lindenschmit, *Tracht und Bewaffnung des römischen Heeres während der Kaiserzeit*, pl. iv 1.)

wore an iron-visored helmet with a red plume, a light shield, and, instead of a cuirass, a tunic of red leather (Arrian, *A. T.* 34). The distinguishing dress of the Roman general was the long cloak (*pālūdāmentum*), generally of scarlet, but sometimes white; occasionally it was fringed and embroidered.

732. The order of march seems to have been fixed in the 2nd century B.C. The Consular Army marched in a single column (*agmen pīlatum*) with the picked allies (*extraordinariī*) in the van. The order of march. Then came the right wing of the allies followed by their baggage-train and that of the *extraordinariī*; after these came the legions, each followed by its baggage. The left wing of the allies, preceded by their baggage, brought up the rear. When the rear was threatened, the *extraordinariī* moved to that position. The legions and *alae* changed their order daily. The cavalry moved either on the flanks or with the infantry to which they were attached. In dangerous situations, the 'square' formation (*agmen quadratum*) was employed. This sometimes resembled the modern square, but generally the arrangement was, that a division in fighting order formed the van with a strong rear-guard, while two more strong divisions marched on the right and left flanks; all the baggage moved in the middle. In imperial days, a legion marched in two divisions with its baggage in the centre. On the march, the legionary carried a formidable load. Besides his weapons and armour, he bore clothes, cooking vessels, rations for seventeen days or longer, entrenching tools, stakes, etc. Marius invented a fork-shaped contrivance (*mulus Marianus*), by means of which the soldier could carry his baggage more easily, and be less encumbered in sudden attacks. Only the heaviest baggage (tents, artillery etc.) was carried on mules or horses.

733. The infantry was always the chief arm of the Roman general. The tactics of the Servian phalanx and of the tripartite arrangement have been described above (§ 709). The glaring drawback of the phalanx was its immobility except in a direct charge; The order of battle. but the tripartite system was also found unsatisfactory. The intervals which lent it mobility jeopardised the legion when manœuvring against the Gauls and Spaniards, whose numbers were preponderating and whose *élan* was marked. Most modern authorities reject the theory that the army fought with open intervals, in *quincuncem* (§ 711). This arrangement was only preliminary, in order to permit the *vélites* to advance and retreat; the lines then closed up, but it was at the moment of this movement that the legion ran the danger of utter disorganization under a bold onslaught. When we are told that Scipio at Zama left intervals between his companies for the free passage of Hannibal's elephants, we must not assume that these intervals were equal to the width of the maniples. The cohortal system was most probably due to Marius; the last employment of the manipular arrangement was under Metellus, in the Jugurthine War. Under the Empire, there was a revival of the phalanx formation. Suetonius em-

ployed it against the Britons, and, from Hadrian's time onwards, it became the regular method of attack. Caesar, in his Gallic wars, had developed the cohortal organisation; the general character of his battles was the same. His force was usually formed in three lines (*triplex acies*), though he sometimes employed only two (*duplex a.*). Once he employed four lines (*quadruplex a.*), and once, in Africa, a single line. According to the latest authorities, the normal depth of each line was eight men. Frontinus mentions as a remarkable arrangement that Pompey at Pharsalus arranged his cohorts ten men deep. The interval between the cohorts in the line was probably only sufficient to mark their individuality without weakening their interdependence. When the front line was tired, it was relieved by the second line, either as a whole by a flank movement, or by passing through intervals in the first line, or, again, by filling up gradually the places of the men in the first line who were rendered *hors de combat*. No nation appreciated more strongly the value of initiative than the Romans. Fighting with their entrenched camp as a base, they nearly always opened the attack. This was sometimes frontal, sometimes the right wing swung forward as at Pharsalus, sometimes the left wing, as in the attack of the 10th and 9th legions at Neuf-Mesnil in 57 B.C. (*B.G.* ii 18—27). Sometimes both wings moved forward (*sinuata acies*), or the centre advanced in a crescent or wedge-shaped line (*cuneus*). The brunt of the attack was left to the legions; the cavalry was used only to check the enemy's horse or light-armed troops

1734. Caesar's first great battle in Gaul exhibits a good example of the evolutions of the legions. The site of this engagement was probably Montmort. He had entrenched his camp at Toulon-sur-Arroux, but provisions falling short, he determined to march thence to Bibracte (*Autun*), where there were granaries. On perceiving this movement, the Helvetii, whom he had been pursuing, turned and attacked his rear near the hill of Armecy. Checking this onslaught with his cavalry, Caesar turned and deployed his four veteran legions on the slopes of the hill, in three lines, each eight men deep. On the crest of the hill were stationed the two new legions with the auxiliaries in charge of the baggage; these troops were ordered to entrench their position. In the afternoon, the Helvetii in dense columns pressed up the hill. When they were within a few yards, the legionaries launched their *pila* and charged. The Helvetii were thrown into hopeless confusion; their shields became useless encumbrances (§ 731). Driven down the slope, they retired to a hill some distance north of Armecy. The Roman lines, pivoting on the right, pressed after them; but their ranks and rear were assailed by the Boii and Tulingi, who had now arrived on the scene. The third Roman line faced about to engage these new foes, while the first two lines attacked the Helvetii, who had renewed the fight. When the cohorts of the first line were tired, they were relieved by the second line, and in their turn the first line relieved the second. By sunset the Gauls were

The defeat of  
the Helvetii  
in 58 B.C.






Fig. 42. Battle of Bibracte.

(From Colonel Stoffel's *Histoire de Jules César*, 1887, planche 23.)

- |       |  |
|-------|--|
| R     | Roman camp on the morning of the battle.           |
| R—R   | Roman baggage entrenched on the hill of Armecy.    |
| H     | Heluetian camp on the morning of the battle.       |
| E     | Gallic waggon laager.                              |
| R—R   | Four Roman legions in line of battle.              |
| H—H   | Heluetii in the first assault.                     |
| H'—H' | Heluetii on retiring to a hill.                    |
| h—h   | Heluetii on returning to the attack.               |
| B—T   | Boii and Tulingi assaulting Roman rear.            |
| k—k   | The first two Roman lines in the second assault.   |
| l—l   | The third Roman line holding the Boii and Tulingi. |
| ..... | Roman line of march.                               |
| →     | Heluetian line of march.                           |

utterly routed, but the weakness or worthlessness of his cavalry prevented Caesar following up his victory (*B. G.* i 23—26)<sup>1</sup>. Again and again, the weakness in cavalry mars the military operations of Rome. The failure of Caesar's cavalry at Neuf-Mesnil nearly led to a crushing disaster (*B. G.*





Fig. 43. Battle of Cannae.

The position of the Carthaginian army at the final stage of the battle is indicated thus .

(After the plans in Colonel T. A. Dodge's *Hannibal*, pp. 362, 368.)

<sup>1</sup> Col. Stoffel's views regarding the site of this battle have here been adopted. There is, however, a serious difficulty. The Boii and Tulingi are described as attacking the Romans *aperto latere*, generally admitted to mean 'on the right flank'. On this ground, Stoffel's plan has been criticised by F. Fröhlich, Col. Bircher and others. Col. Bircher holds that the Roman legions originally fronted south or south-west, and that the hill to which the Heluetii retreated was on the further side of the valley through which the road runs to Luzy. On this hypothesis, it seems strange that Caesar makes no mention of crossing the stream (Auzon). Perhaps Caesar, in describing the attack of the B. and T., has anticipated the moment when the third Roman line changed front and met the newcomers, who advanced on the right flank of that line. See T. Rice Holmes, *Conquest of Gaul*, pp. 614 f, *Caesar's Commentaries*, pp. 20 f.

ii 18—27). The worst defeats that Roman arms experienced were inflicted by generals who had good cavalry and knew how to use it. The battle of Cannae is a striking example of the disadvantages under which the Roman armies laboured in this respect.

735. Hannibal spent the winter of 217—216 B.C. in the neighbourhood of Geronium. His army lived on the results of its foraging; consequently, when the supplies in the vicinity were exhausted, he determined to move southwards into Apulia. In the spring he seized Cannae, an important corn-*dépôt* south of the Aufidus (*Ofanto*). Cannae. The Roman consuls, Aemilius Paulus and Varro, moved after him, and in June encamped at Canusium, about six miles west of the Carthaginian headquarters. Their forces comprised eight strong legions of 5000 foot and 300 horse, with a correspondingly large contingent of allies, equal foot and double horse, amounting in all to 80,000 foot and 7200 horse. Against these Hannibal had 40,000 foot and 10,000 horse. After a preliminary skirmish in which the Romans had the advantage (probably a result designed by Hannibal to whet the rashness of Varro), the consuls advanced their camp within three miles of that of the Carthaginians. At the same time, they placed a small camp on the north side of the river, to protect the foragers. Hannibal thereupon offered battle, forming his line with his right flank resting on the south bank of the river. Aemilius, whose turn it was to command (the consuls commanded on alternate days), declined to engage. The next day, Varro took over the command. Hannibal, by sending his Numidian horse across the river to attack the Roman foragers and threaten the smaller camp, induced him to move. Leaving 11,000 men to the larger camp with orders to attack the Carthaginian camp during the battle, the Roman general crossed the river with his left flank leading, and drawing off some of the troops from the smaller camp (3000 were left to guard it), formed his line for battle. Hannibal thereupon forded the river in two columns, covering his advance with slingers and archers in such a way as to screen his tactical formation; 8000 foot were left to guard his camp. He drew up his forces with the river at his back, but this weakness in position was nullified by the fact that the Aufidus at this season was probably fordable everywhere. Varro in consequence wheeled his line to the south, leaving his right flank still leaning on the small camp. Notwithstanding his superior numbers, he could not outflank the Carthaginian, whose flanks were protected by the river. But trusting for victory to his splendid infantry, 66,000 strong, he determined to employ it all to deal a crushing blow. He therefore modified the usual formation of the legion, arranging the maniples so that their depth was greater than their front. This in itself was a grave error. The men were unaccustomed to the formation, and it destroyed the mobility of the legions. On the extreme right were the Roman cavalry, 2400 strong. Next these, forming the right wing, were the Roman legions—also an innovation, the regular position of such troops being the centre. The

allied foot formed the left wing, flanked by the allied cavalry, 4800 strong. Hannibal had anticipated the designs of his enemy, and made his dispositions accordingly. On the left, opposite the Roman cavalry, he placed his magnificent heavy cavalry, Spaniards and Gauls, 8000 strong, in two lines under the command of Hasdrubal. On his extreme right were his 2000 Numidian horse, facing the allied horse. In the centre he placed, in a crescent line, his Spanish and Gallic infantry; his finest foot, the Africans, who were equipped Roman fashion with arms captured at the Trebia and Trasimene, were placed on the flanks of this crescent. To these last and his heavy cavalry he trusted for victory; the crescent-shaped line was designed to be repulsed, and the Numidians were intended only to threaten and skirmish with the enemy's left. After a fierce encounter of the light-armed troops on both sides, the lines closed. Hasdrubal's horse charged, and by sheer weight of numbers crushed the Roman cavalry, whose gallantry was unavailing; large numbers of them dismounted and carried on the fight on foot. By the rout of the Roman horse, the Roman infantry on the right were pressed in upon their centre. Hasdrubal's force then made a circuit in the rear of the Roman line, and assailed the allied cavalry. These, already threatened in front by the Numidians, broke and fled, pursued by the Numidians, while Hasdrubal wheeled back and attacked the Roman infantry in the rear and flanks. These last, meantime, had pressed forward gradually, as Hannibal intended; they drove in the salient crescent until the crescent assumed a concave shape. In this fighting the Roman line, already too closely formed, became still more compressed, until the soldiers had no room to use their arms; still the weight of their mass bore them onward. Hannibal, seizing his chance, brought his Africans into action, wheeling them against the flanks of the dense Roman infantry. When Hasdrubal at the same time thundered down on the Roman rear, charging again and again, the demoralization was completed. The rest was massacre; the battle was over. The attack on Hannibal's camp was also a failure. So ended one of the most famous battles in history. Undoubtedly the Romans were badly generalled. But Cannae only exhibits with particular clearness a blot which is marked again and again in Roman campaigns—the weakness in the cavalry arm, and the consequent danger to the infantry, however efficient and brave the latter may be. Towards the end of the Second Punic War, Roman generals learnt a little from the teachings of Hannibal. At Zama, the charges of Massinissa and Laelius on the Carthaginian wings contributed materially towards the victory. But the lessons in battle tactics which Hannibal taught the Romans were slight, compared with what they learnt in strategy. Previous to the Second Punic War (excepting Alexander and a few isolated cases), generals won their fights by tactics. From this time onwards, Roman generals exhibit true strategical ability. The victory of the Metaurus, the tactics of the fight, and the fine strategical movement of Nero on interior lines, were due to the schooling of the Punic enemy.



## FORTIFICATION AND SIEGE-CRAFT.

736. The Roman army, after a day's march, invariably fortified their camp. A tribune, with some centurions or engineers (*mensores, antemensores*), went in advance with a contrivance called a *grōma*, and marked out the site, if possible, on a slope, so that the camp faced downhill, on open ground within reach of forage, wood and water. The headquarters (*praetorium*) were first marked with a flag; then the corners of the camp were fixed by flags of different colours. As a camp was always of the same shape and arrangement, every man knew what he had to do when he reached the selected ground. A ditch was first dug forming a square, each side, for a normal army of two legions and the allied contingents (§ 714), being about 2100 feet; inside the ditch a rampart (*agger*) of earth was raised, and this was strengthened by a palisade (*uallum*) of the stakes which the soldiers carried. The camp was divided laterally by a street 100 feet wide (*uia principalis*), the front and larger portion (*praetentura*) being occupied by the legions and the allies; the hinder part (*retentura*) contained the headquarters, the tents of picked troops (*delecti, euocati*) and the higher officers, the paymasters' quarters (*quaestorium*) and the camp meeting-place (*forum*). In the rear of these ran another street (*uia retenturae*). Between this and the rear wall were the quarters of the *extraordinarii* (§ 714) and the hospitals. The front portion of the camp was divided by two main streets, the *uia praetoriana*, reaching from the headquarters to the front gate, and the *uia quintana*, which ran at right angles to the former. Each tent, to which men were allotted, was allowed a space of 100 sq. ft. Besides the front-gate, there were two side-gates and a rear-gate (*porta decumana*). Watches were kept night and day. There were four reliefs in the night-watches; a guard consisted of four men, each of which stood sentinel in turn; the vigilance of these was tested by an ingenious system of going the rounds (Polybius, vi 34, 7—12).

The Camp:  
(a) under the Republic.

737. In imperial days, the plan and arrangements of the camp differed from the above-mentioned system. The shape of the camp was rectangular, its length being about one-third greater than its breadth. The legions were encamped along the whole line of the ramparts, and were separated by a street 30 ft. wide (*uia sagularis*) from the rest of the camp. The front half of the camp was smaller than the rear portion; the *uia quintana* now traversed the rear portion parallel to the *uia principalis*; the space between these streets was styled the *latera praetorii*, and the term *retentura* was applied to the place between the *uia quintana* and the *porta decumana*. For further details the reader should consult the treatise of Hyginus, who is our chief informant on the imperial camp, as Polybius is concerning the Republican camp. When camps of a more permanent character (*castra stativa*) were necessary, their defences were strengthened by deepening the ditch and raising the

(b) under the Empire.

palisade, and, in later times, by placing artillery in embrasures in the ramparts.

738. The Romans excelled in fortifications of a permanent character.

Fortification  
of cities.

All their cities and towns were surrounded with walls. The masonry varied; sometimes it consisted of solid ashlar, more frequently of stone-faced rubble, or small stones set in strong mortar; in later days, a mixture of brick-work and of diamond-shaped masonry was very common. The remains of Pompeii may serve as a typical example (Fig. 44). This town was surrounded by an outer (lower) and inner (higher) stone wall, the space between the two being filled with hard-packed earth. These walls were supported on the inside by strong stone buttresses, and flights of steps at intervals led from the inside of the city to the top of the wall. The top of the outer wall was built with embrasures from which the defenders could hurl missiles. At fixed distances towers were built, to which access was gained from the wall. These towers were three-storied, steps leading on the inside from one story to another. Embrasures were built in the walls of each story, and there was a small postern at the base of each tower. The city gates were designed with special care. Usually they were built in a tower or between two towers.




Fig. 44. Section of the walls of Pompeii.

(After Overbeck's *Pompeii*, ed. 3, fig. 7.)

The *porta nigra* at Trier is a good example of the latter plan. Here the two flanking towers project on the inside and the outside, so as to command

both exit and entrance. The double gateway between the towers leads into a small covered space; if an enemy forced his way into this, he could be cut off by the closing of the outer and inner gates. The towers are of four stories, the three top-stories consisting of open galleries from which a hail of missiles could be poured down upon an attacking force. Even if the enemy succeeded in forcing his way into the city at some other part of the walls, these gate-towers remained as forts into which the garrison could retreat, and from which they could command the walls.

739. The frontiers of the Roman Empire were defended by systems of forts (*castella*) and entrenchments. Of these the most important were the German (*limes Germanicus*) and the Raetian (*limes Raeticus*), and the lines which guarded Roman Britain.

Frontier  
defences.

The first two formed part of a gigantic scheme of defence which reached from the mouth of the Rhine to the mouth of the Danube. Where the two rivers formed the frontier, forts only were erected on the banks. Where the frontier left the rivers, walls of earth or stone, strengthened by forts at intervals, were established. Such a wall ran from Rheinbrohl on the Rhine along the Taunus ridge to Vindonissa (Windisch). This was the *limes Germanicus* which was afterwards connected with the Danubian frontier defences by the *limes Raeticus*, which ran from Lauriacum (Lorch on the Rems) to Kehlheim on the Danube. While the Germanic *limes* was only an earthen rampart, the Raetian was a stone wall, palisaded on top, with a deep ditch in front. In Britain, two walls were erected. Hadrian's wall ran from Segedunum (Wall's End) to Glannibanta (on the Solway). It consisted of a stone wall about 20 feet high, and six or eight feet broad, strengthened by towers and fortified gates. On the north side was a deep fosse, while on the south there was an earth-wall (*uallum*) consisting of a mound, a fosse, and a double mound. Between the stone wall and the *uallum* ran a road, along which were placed at intervals fourteen large camps (*praetenturae*). The wall of Antoninus was not so elaborate a structure; it consisted of a huge fosse backed by an earth-wall. Both these walls served a double purpose; they were a check on the rebellious tribes to the south, and were at the same time bases for future operations in the north.

740. In the earlier days of the Republic, the Romans did not exhibit any considerable skill in siege-craft. Long investments, such as that of Veii, were the rule; the ram and scaling-ladder were the chief devices employed to force an entry. The campaigns against Pyrrhus made the Romans familiar with the inventions of Greek engineers. This knowledge they applied in the siege of Agrigentum in 250 B.C., but their first great achievements were the capture of Syracuse (defended by the genius of Archimedes) in 212 B.C. and of Capua in the following year. The methods usually employed to capture a fortress were immediate storming (*oppugnatio*), investment (*obsidio*), or investment combined with an elaborate system of assault (*oppugnatio longinqua*). In storming, the walls were first cleared by the missiles of the archers and slingers; occasionally light artillery was used. Storming parties or legionaries then swept forward, the trenches were filled with fascines, and scaling ladders applied to the walls. Often, in approaching the walls, the 'tortoise' (*testudo*) was used; this was a protective

Siege-craft  
and artillery.

screen formed by locking shields, which the front rank held vertically and the following ranks horizontally. When an entry was forced, a gate was opened and the main body of the troops poured in. In some cases an investment was the only means of reducing a stronghold. The chief lines of communication were occupied by large camps, and the enemy were completely isolated by a circle of entrenchments, the trenches being sometimes filled with water. In front of these lines strong redoubts were placed, and obstacles of all kinds—deep trenches, pits in which sharp stakes were concealed, caltrops etc.—rendered sudden sorties impracticable. The more vulnerable parts of the lines were doubled and otherwise strengthened. When threatened by a relief force (as at Alesia in B.C. 52), the besiegers made on the further side of their camps a second line of entrenchments, consisting of rampart and palisade with towers at intervals. But, as a rule, investment was only a prelude to a long series of assaults. Entrenchments were made, the enemies' water-supply was, if possible, cut off, and siege material collected. Archers, slingers, and artillery swept the walls with showers of missiles, under cover of which endeavours were made to effect a breach. Fosses were filled, and the ground was levelled to facilitate the working of various breaching-engines. A huge terrace or causeway (*agger*)<sup>1</sup>, composed of earth tightly packed in a framework of beams and wattle-work, was built opposite a vulnerable part of the walls. Meanwhile, the besiegers were protected by hurdles (*cratēs*) and divers kinds of wheeled shelters—screens (*plutei*), sheds (*uineae*), and penthouses (*musculi*, to protect sappers; *testudines*, to cover parties working a ram, filling fosses, or engaged on the front of the *agger*). When the *agger* was finished, towers on wheels (*turres ambulatoriae*), 50 to 180 feet high with many stories, were moved along it close up to the walls. Artillery and light-armed troops placed in these rendered the walls untenable, and the assailants gained the battlements by means of drawbridges (*sambūcae*). The 'ram' (*aries*) used for making a breach was, in its simplest form, an iron-tipped beam dashed against the wall by a number of strong men; but there were also heavier rams, 60 or even 100 feet long, swung by ropes or moved on rollers. Sometimes they were provided with a sharp point and acted as drills (*īrēbrae*). Poles with hook-like fixtures (*falces murales*) were also used to tear out stones. The besieged hurled down pots of fire, melted lead, torches, burning arrows (*fālārīcae*) and stones on their enemies, and endeavoured to crush, or set fire to, the siege engines. With nooses of rope or huge pincers they tried to seize the ram or to break off its head by dropping boulders. They made counter-mines to check the mines (*cūnicūli*) of the besiegers; by mining, also, they sought to overturn the towers.

The propelling force of the artillery (*tormenta*) was generally derived from torsion, but in certain engines probably from metal springs. In torsion-engines a single stout wooden arm, or a pair of arms, was set in tightly twisted ropes made of sinews, horsehair, or human hair. Engines with two arms (*catapultae*, *ballistae*)<sup>2</sup> hurled huge javelins, iron-tipped beams, and stone balls of considerable size. The two arms were connected

<sup>1</sup> The height of the *agger* varied; at Auaricum, it was 80 feet high and 330 feet broad (Caes., *B.G.*, vii 24, 1); sometimes it was higher than the walls (Josephus, *b. Jud.*, iii 7, 10). When the *agger* was not as high as the walls, a ram was worked from the lower stages of the tower. Sometimes several *aggēres* were built against different parts of the walls; at the siege of Jerusalem there were four of these structures (Josephus, v 11, 4). On the Column of Trajan there is an *agger* represented, with an embrasure for artillery above, and a casemate below; from the latter the walls could be attacked either by mines or a ram.

<sup>2</sup> There is considerable confusion as regards these terms. For Vitruvius, the *catapulta* is an engine for discharging heavy javelins (*pila catapultaria*), and the *ballista* is a two-armed engine for hurling stones. For Ammianus and Vegetius, the *ballista* is a javelin-engine. The *scorpio* is, for Vitruvius, a *catapulta*; for Livy, Polybius, and Vegetius, it is a *manuballista*, and, for Ammianus, it is the same as the *ōnāger*.



by a rope band which acted like a bow-string (Fig. 45). The one-armed engines (*ὀνάγρι*) were really gigantic slings; the missile—a heavy stone ball—was placed in a strong sling attached to the extremity of the arm, which, when released, recoiled vertically and flung the ball. Cross-bows (*arcuballistæ*, *manuballistæ*) worked by one man were common. It was in sieges, both for attack and defence, that artillery was principally used. Under the Empire, its employment in the field became more frequent. Legions had their own engines (Tac., *Hist.* iii 23). In the time of Vegetius, each cohort had its *ὀνάγρι* and each century its *carroballista*, a large engine drawn by mules.




Fig. 45. (a) Back of the capitulum, or frame; (b) Side of the Catapulta, according to Vitruvius, x 10 (from E. Schramm's *Griechische-römische Geschütze*, 1910, t. 9).

- (a) The twisted ropes (*τόνοι*, *funes*, *nerui*).
- (b) The arms (*ἀγκῶνες*, *braccia*) to which was attached a strong string (*τοξίτις*).
- (c) The pipe (*σύριγξ*, *canaliculus*).
- (d) The projector (*διώστρον*) which moved in a groove cut in the pipe and carried the arrow.
- (e) The windlass worked by hand-spikes (*σφυτάλαι*) by which the cord (*καταγωγίς*) drawing back the projector was tightened.
- (f) The catch (*χελρ*, *epitoxis*) which held the string.
- (g) The trigger (*σχαστηρία*, *manucla*) the pulling of which opened the catch and released the string.

## MINOR PARTICULARS CONCERNING THE SERVICE.

741. Under the Republic, a levy (*dilectus*) was held each year on a day fixed by the consuls. Recruiting officers (*conquisitores*) were despatched to rally the outlying districts. The duties of these officers were much enlarged in 89 B.C., when all Italians became liable for service. The practices of Corporal Bardolph were not unknown. Exemption (*uacatio*), which was granted only in special cases, such as physical defects, the holding of a magistracy or priesthood, or as a reward for former distinguished service, could often be procured by bribes. The punishments for avoiding service were severe; the culprit was liable to have his goods confiscated, to be imprisoned, or even sold as a slave. The procedure at these early levies was as follows. The tribunes (§ 751) were first appointed. Then a tribe was chosen by lot. Four of its members with names of good omen (*Saluius*, *Statorius*, etc.) were first called, and one was appointed to each of the four legions (the number enrolled under ordinary conditions). Other names were next called, four at a time, until the tribal quota was exhausted. Then, another tribe was chosen, and so on, till the legions were complete. The legionary cavalry was enrolled from the lists of the previous census. In the case of an army raised to meet a sudden danger (*exercitus subitarius* or *tumultuarius*), the consuls modified the ordinary procedure and enrolled the tribal quotas at once, as seemed best to them. After the levy, the troops took the oath of obedience and loyalty (*sacramentum*); one soldier repeated it at length, and each soldier said *idem in me*. This oath gave the legal commission to the army; desertion now became a capital offence. The obligation of the oath remained till the soldier received a regular discharge (*missio*). Emergency-armies took the oath in a body (*coniuratio*). The oath under the Empire became one of allegiance to the emperor, and was taken twice annually, viz. on the kalends of January and on the anniversary of the emperor's accession. Even before the time of Marius (§ 717) freemen without property (*capite censi*) were required to serve. Freedmen were enrolled in the Social War. But slavery and conviction of serious crimes were always bars to military service. Towards the close of the Republic, Pompeius and Caesar instituted the practice of enrolling provincials who did not possess the citizenship. In fact, Caesar's chief recruiting ground was Cisalpine and Transalpine Gaul. From the latter came the famous *V Alauda*. Under the Empire, this practice was confined to the eastern legions; the western recruits were either citizens or received the citizenship on enlistment. At this time freedmen, though legally excluded, could easily evade the restriction. In early days, little stress was laid on stature. 'It is far more important that the soldier should be strongly built than tall' (Vegetius). But under the Empire there was a certain standard (*incommā* or *encommā*) for special *corps*, such as the first cohorts of

the legions and for the guards; this was 5 ft. 10 in. For a long time Italy had ceased to supply the legions (§ 724), and, from the end of the first century A.D., each legion began to have a national or local character. Under Hadrian, local conscription for each legion became the rule (for the city troops see § 728). The legionaries were recruited mostly from senatorial provinces. The auxiliaries came from the imperial provinces, Africa and non-Romanised regions, from which their cohorts took their titles. Under Hadrian the senatorial provinces (in which no legions were now stationed) ceased to supply legionaries, and members of senatorial urban communities could find a place only in the guards and city troops.

742. Under the Republic, the military age was from 17 to 46; the legionary was liable to serve from sixteen to twenty campaigns, the horsemen ten. Augustus changed the terms and mode of service (§ 719). *Euocati* and *uexillarii*, of course, served for longer periods. Under Hadrian, the legionary served twenty-five years; for the last five years he was released (*immunis*) from the ordinary camp-duties.

Terms of  
service.

743. In 406 B.C. the State undertook to reimburse the soldier for his field-expenses, deducting the cost of provisions, clothes, etc., which he received from the military stores (§ 710). Pay in the strict sense (*stipendium*) seems to date from the second century B.C., the horsemen receiving three times, the centurions twice as much as the legionaries. For the last the scale was 120 *denarii* annually. Under Caesar this was increased to 225, paid in three instalments. Domitian raised the scale to 300 for the legionaries, the praetorians receiving 720, the urban cohorts 360, and the centurions 5000 *denarii*. Increase of pay was one of the soldier's rewards, the recipients being styled *sesquiplarii*, *duplarii* according as their pay was increased by one-half or doubled. Little is known of the scale of pay for the officers; in the third century A.D. the tribune received 25,000 H.S. annually. The accounts of the legion were managed by cashiers (*arcarii*) and paymasters (*dispensatores*) and a staff of clerks (*librarii*, *actuarii*). The last were generally of servile condition. Under the Empire, a soldier received on his discharge a lump sum amounting to 3000 *denarii* for the legionary, and 5000 for the praetorian. In two other ways, also, provision was made for old age, (a) by the imperial largesse (*donativum*), (b) by benefit societies (*scholae* or *scolae*). The former originated in the share of the booty which a soldier of the Republic received at a triumph. The emperors gave large sums of this sort on special occasions, such as their accession, or in their wills. Half of this was deposited in the 'purse' (*foliis*) of the soldier's cohort, and went to swell the amount which he received on discharge. The *scolae* was composed of minor officers (§ 749). The members of a *scola* at Lambaesis paid an entrance fee (*scannarium*) of 720 *denarii*, and the society made grants on specified occasions—death, discharge, promotion or degradation, or departure on a voyage, of one of its members.

Pay.

744. The rations of the Roman soldier were chiefly farinaceous, wheat forming the staple diet, and barley a less desirable alternative; meat was secondary, and it was considered a great hardship when such was the only provision. The wheat was served out unground, each legionary receiving one bushel per month. The soldiers ground it in hand-mills and made either bread or porridge (*puls*, hence the military nickname *pultīphāgōnides*). In later times, the military stores supplied biscuits, salt pork, suet, etc. The chief drink in the army was a sour wine called *posca*. The cost of rations was deducted from the soldier's pay, but under the Empire the rations of corn were free.

745. The Roman army, as the term *exercitus* implies, was hard worked and well drilled. The tribunes (§ 751) were responsible for the general discipline, but the chief work in training the soldiers fell upon the centurions and the drill-masters (*campidoctores*, *exercitatores*). Twice daily the recruits were drilled, and the whole legion exercised in running, jumping, swimming, javelin-throwing, fencing at a stake (called *ludus quintanus*, 'quintain', because it took place in the *uia quintana*, § 736). The cavalry and light troops were trained in riding and archery. Frequently field-reviews (*lustrationes*) and manœuvres (*decur-siones*) took place, as well as route-marches (*ambulationes*). These last were made thrice each month, twenty miles being covered at the regulation pace of four miles per hour, varied by forced marching at five miles per hour. Discipline was very strict, and the punishments were many. Centurions were often brutal; Tacitus (*Ann.* i 23, 12) tells of one nicknamed 'Give-me-another' (*cēdō alteram*), from his habit of breaking his vine-staff on the backs of his company. When a whole legion offended, it was punished by being bivouacked outside the camp, or by short rations, barley being substituted for wheat, or, like the legions which fled from Cannae, by being despatched to an undesirable district. Cowardice or mutiny in a legion was visited by the death of every tenth, or twentieth, or hundredth man (*decimatio*, *vicēsimatio*, *centēsimatio*). Individual offences were met by flogging (which was sometimes inflicted on an officer), by loss of pay and service, or degradation (*ordinis ademptio*). A horseman was degraded by being reduced to the infantry or even to the ranks of the slingers. A privileged soldier might be ordered to perform ordinary duty (*munerum indictio*). Death, usually by stoning and clubbing (*justuarium*) was the punishment of desertion, cowardice, failure to pass the watchword, loss of standards, etc. In imperial times, the death sentence could only be given by the legate (§ 751).

746. The army was never suffered to be idle. In times of peace it was always employed in different ways. The great frontier-lines and the walls in Britain (§ 739), roads, bridges, canals, amphitheatres, temples, harbours, etc., attest the industry of the military engineers. Sometimes an army was employed in agricultural tasks, such as planting vineyards or in stamping out a locust plague, as occurred once in Syria (Plin. *N. H.* xi 106).

Works in time  
of peace.



747. Each legion remained in the same quarters for considerable periods, often for generations. The III *Augusta*, for example, except for one brief interval, was settled at Lambaesis for more than three hundred years. Under such conditions the soldier was equivalent to a colonist. Outside the camps, settlements (*canabae*) sprang up, whither the sutlers and usual camp-followers gathered. There the soldier, when his years of service were over, made his home; and there the soldiers' wives lived. For, though regular marriage (*connubium*) was denied the legionary until the time of Septimius Seuerus, yet he was allowed to have a mate (*focaria*), generally a native woman, and the children of such unions entered the legion as a matter of course. Thus legionary service became an hereditary profession. The *canabae* gradually grew into municipalities and were the origin of many modern cities. When regular marriage was at length permitted, the married soldiers lived in the township, and visited the camp daily to attend to their professional duties. Thus, the legionary settlements became most important agents in diffusing Roman culture; each was a little Rome, with its theatre, amphitheatre, forum, baths, etc.

748. One of the most signal marks of distinction which a commander could receive under the Republic was the laurel wreath, with which he was crowned when his soldiers, after a victory, saluted him as *imperator*. This was generally followed by a triumph, a semi-sacred parade in which the troops and their general (clad in a gorgeous robe and riding in a four-horse chariot) passed with captives and spoil through the streets of the capital. If a 'lesser triumph' (*ouatio*) was decreed, the general marched on foot, wore a wreath of myrtle instead of laurel, and in other ways made a less imposing display. Under the Empire a triumph was enjoyed, with very rare exceptions, only by the reigning prince. Instead of a triumph a general was now honoured with the 'triumphal ornaments', *i.e.* he was allowed to wear at festivals the *insignia* which a general formerly wore at a triumph. Sometimes also, a statue was erected in his honour. The highest reward for individual acts of prowess was the crown of oak leaves (*corona civica*), awarded to one who had saved a fellow-soldier's life in the field. Crowns were also awarded to those who were the first to scale an enemy's walls or enter his camp (*coronae murales, castrenses, uallares*). There were other decorations for distinguished service, *phalerae* (round embossed plaques of metal), armlets (*armillae*) and necklets (*torques*). The last were usually worn like the *phalerae*, suspended over the breastplate. A soldier also was rewarded by exemption from certain duties, or by increase of pay (§ 743), or by promotion to one of the minor positions of trust or command in the service.

749. These minor officers may be divided into two groups: (a) those attached to the immediate service of a higher officer, (b) those who belonged to the *corps*. The former consisted chiefly of clerks and accountants (*librarii, notarii, commentarienses*,

Camp life.

Military  
rewards and  
distinctions.The inferior  
officers  
(*principales*).

*exceptatores, dispensatores*). In attendance on the legates who controlled a province were a body of torturers (*quaestionarii*). Each chief commander had one, sometimes two adjutants styled *cornicularii* from the small horn which they wore on their helmets. The *secutores tribuni* were adjutants belonging to the praetorian, urban or watch cohorts. A private soldier might be detailed to serve as an orderly (*singularis*) or as a groom (*strator*) to an officer or to some high state-official. Higher officers also could detail soldiers to perform special duties; such men were styled the *beneficiarii* of those officers.

750. Among the minor officers belonging to the *corps* were the various classes of standard-bearers (*vexillarii, aquiliferi, signiferi, imaginiferi*).



Fig. 46. Roman standard-bearer. Pintanus, *signifer cohortis V Asturum*.

From a monument in the Bonn Museum; Lindenschmit, pl. iii 2.

The *uexillum* was the oldest standard of the Roman army. As a signal for battle, it was displayed over the general's tent. It was a small red flag hanging from a transverse bar, on which sometimes a little figure of Victory was placed. It was the special ensign of the legionary horse, as well as of the cohorts of *uigiles* (§ 730), certain auxiliary cohorts, and special detachments (§ 722). The eagle was the standard of the legion; in the days of Marius it replaced previous emblems, such as the Minotaur, the bear, etc. Under the Empire, each legion and auxiliary cohort seem to have had an *imaginifer*, who carried a statuette of the reigning emperor. The *signum* was a silver-plated pole, adorned chiefly with metal discs (*phalærae*), sometimes also with crowns, and images of animals which were regarded as military mascots; at the base of the lowest disc was a crescent. It was the ensign of the legionary cohort, as well as of the centuries of the praetorian and urban guards. It was also carried by the squadrons of the *equites singulares* and by the *numeri* (§ 727). Fig. 46.

Other minor officers belonging to the *corps* were the drill-masters, trumpeters, horn-blowers, corporals of the watchword (*tessērarii*), priests (*haruspices*), artisans of various kinds, and the orderlies (*optiōnes*) of the centurions and decurions. The *spēculātōres* were originally legionaries detailed for special duties such as carrying despatches, sometimes to act as executioners. In the first century A.D. they seem to have formed a special *corps*. The chief steps in the promotion of the ordinary soldier were (1) *secutor tribuni*, (2) *beneficiarius*, *optio cohortis* or *optio carceris*, (3) *tesserarius*, (4) *optio centuriae*, (5) *uexillarius* or *signifer*, (6) *cornicularius tribuni*, (7) *beneficiarius praefecti*, *subpraefecti*, (8) *cornicularius praefecti*, (9) *centurio*. Of course, the above order is not exhaustive, and it was largely varied.

751. In Republican days the chief command of an army was vested in a consul, sometimes a dictator, more rarely a proconsul or propraetor. During the Empire, the supreme commander of all the forces was the emperor, who delegated his authority to the different provincial governors (*lĕgātī Augusti pro praetore*). The command of each legion was, in Republican times, vested in six tribunes, who commanded in rotation. From 207 B.C. twenty-four of these officers were elected by the people (*tribuni militum a populo*). When more than four legions were enlisted the consuls chose the additional tribunes, who were called *Rūfūli*. Under the Empire, the practice of Caesar was followed (§ 718), and a special officer (*lĕgātus lĕgionis*) commanded each legion. These officers were men of ripe experience. Their powers were larger than those of the Republican tribunes, commanding as they did not merely the legion, but also the auxiliaries attached to it. The office of legionary tribune was still continued, but the duties were less responsible. They attended to the exercises and drills, granted discharges or furloughs, kept the military rolls (marking the names of the dead with ☉, those of the living with a V or T). They were occasionally entrusted with the command

Superior  
officers.

on the march, or even in battle. When standing camps were instituted the new command, *praefectura castrorum s. legionis*, became a most important one (§ 721). It was generally reserved for distinguished centurions. In Egypt the *praefectus castrorum* was supreme commander, since no senator (consequently no *legatus legionis*) could enter that country.

752. But it was on the sixty centurions that the discipline and the efficiency of the legion chiefly depended. Their position became a most responsible one in the manipular tripartite legion (§ 711), and their old titles and rank were preserved in the cohortal legion. Thus the 1st centurion of the 1st maniple in each cohort was called *pilus prior*, the 2nd *pilus posterior*; the 1st of the 2nd maniple *princeps prior*, etc., the 1st of the 3rd maniple *hastatus prior*, etc.; the 1st centurion of the 1st maniple of the 1st cohort was called *primus pilus prior* or *primipilus* and was chief of the sixty centurions. The centurions of the first cohort were especially distinguished; they received twice the pay of the other centurions, and were entitled *primi ordines*. In this cohort there was no *pilus posterior*, but there seem (at least in some cases) to have been two *primipili*; probably the senior of these ranked as *primipilus* proper and had charge of the eagle, while the other *primipilus*, assisted by a sub-centurion or *optio*, commanded the first century (§ 721).

The  
centurions.



Fig. 47. Roman centurion.

From the monument (in the Bonn Museum) of M. Caelius, *optio*, or deputy-centurion, of the XVIIIth legion, who *cecidit bello Variano*. He wears a *corona civica* of oak-leaves, and a tunic and cuirass; on his shoulders are two medallions with lions' heads; on his breast, two *torques* and five *phalerae*; and, in his right hand, the *vitis* or vine staff, which is the emblem of his office (Lindenschmit, pl. i 6, 5; Baumeister, *Denkm.*, p. 2050).



There was a regular system of promotion from the lowest rank in the centurionship to the rank of *primipilus*. The position of centurion was one to which the ordinary soldier aspired as the culminating point of his career. The duties of the office were multifarious, chiefly disciplinary as was marked by the emblem of the office—a vine-staff (*uitis*). Frequently a centurion found opportunity, especially by fees received for exemptions from duty (*uacationes*), to acquire sufficient wealth to entitle him to equestrian rank.

753. Under the Empire the medical service of the army became a regular institution, though the standing of a doctor was but that of an inferior officer (*principalis*). Each legion had one or more of these men who attended the wounded and sick in their tents or in the hospital (*ualetudinarium*). Sometimes a doctor received double the ordinary pay, but this was exceptional. As well as doctors, there were regular veterinary surgeons and a veterinary hospital.

Medical  
service.

J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* (*Das Militärwesen*, pp. 319—621), 1884<sup>2</sup>; M. J. de la Chauvelays, *L'art militaire chez les Romains*, 1884; H. Schiller, *Die römischen Kriegsaltertümer* (Part IV, 2, pp. 229—268 in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, iv (2), 1887); L. Lindenschmit, *Tracht und Bewaffnung des r. Heeres während der Kaiserzeit*, 1882; M. Fickelscherer, *Das Kriegswesen der Alten*, Leipzig, 1888; A. von Domaszewski, *Die Rangordnung des römischen Heeres*, Bonn, 1908; E. Schramm, *Griechisch-römische Geschütze*, Metz, 1910; R. Schneider, *Die antiken Geschütze der Saalburg*, Berlin, 1910<sup>2</sup>, and in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *Geschütze*. For the Roman camp, see the article on *Castra* in Daremberg-Saglio. For the Punic Wars, T. A. Dodge, *Hannibal*, New York, 1891, R. Oehler, *Der letzte Feldzug des Barkiden Hasdrubal und die Schlacht am Metaurus*, 1897, K. Lehmann, *Die Angriffe der drei Barkiden auf Italien*, 1905; for the army of Caesar, T. Rice Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, London, 1911<sup>2</sup>; G. Veith, *Feldzüge C. Julius Caesars*, Vienna, 1906; F. Stolle, *Das Lager und Heer der Römer*, Strassburg, 1912; for the campaigns of A.D. 69—70, B. W. Henderson, *Civil War and Rebellion in the Roman Empire*, 1908. On the manipular system, Th. Steinwender, *Ursprung und Entwicklung des Manipularsystems*, Danzig, 1908.

Bibliography.

## VI. 14. THE ROMAN NAVY.

754. THE history of the Roman navy falls into two parts, the dividing line being the reforms of Sulla. Prior to Augustus, there were no standing fleets, ships being built or fitted out when required.

The first treaty with Carthage (not later than 348 B.C.) presupposes that Rome possessed warships; and these warships were Roman or Italian, for Rome controlled no Greek ships prior to 327 (treaty with Naples). The docks at Rome (*naualia*) existed in 337, when they received the captured warships of Antium. Rome therefore possessed a native navy from an early date; but its strength was small, as is shown by Carthage undertaking in 279 to provide all the ships for the alliance against Pyrrhus.

The old navy.

**755.** The general command at sea was vested in the consuls, whose power embraced, not only Italy, but the seas around, and the over-seas theatre of war. But, for convenience, the consul must often have commanded the fleet by his deputy (*praefectus*); and in 311 a resolution of the people gave the people the appointment of two fleet-masters, under the title *duoviri nauales classis ornandae reficiendaeque causa*. *Duoviri* appear again in 283, 181 and 178, i.e. before and after, but not during, the great wars; the double duumviral squadron consisted usually of 20 ships, 10 under each *duumvir*.

**756.** After the war with Pyrrhus the Italic towns became bound under their treaties to supply Rome with ships, but their contributions were small. In 210 twelve ships, in 191 twenty-five, were thus obtained. Locri had to furnish 2, Regium 1, Messana 1; the largest number must have come from Neapolis and Tarentum. The ships were pentekontors and open triremes. In connexion with this extension of Roman sea-power, the number of quaestors was raised from 4 to 8 by the addition of 4 fleet-quaestors (*quaestores classici*), part of whose business was apparently to see that the allies supplied their quota of men and ships. Two were stationed at Ostia and Cales in Campania, one probably at Ariminum; the position of the fourth is unknown.

**757.** The first Punic war compelled Rome to become a great sea-power. At first the Romans employed the Italic contingents alone; but in 260 they built 100 quinqueremes and 20 triremes, probably also refitting the old ships of 283, and under Duilius vanquished the Carthaginian fleet of 130 sail at Mylae, it is said by means of a boarding-bridge (*corvus*, κόραξ), held up against the mast by ropes and pulleys and let down on to the enemy's deck, thus enabling the Roman troops to board. Subsequently, 330 Roman ships are said to have defeated 350 Carthaginian at Ecnomus (256) with a loss of 100; and 350 Roman to have defeated 200 Carthaginian at Hermaea (254) with a loss of 114 captured. The Roman fleet, twice destroyed in a storm and rebuilt, was in 249 defeated by a probably inferior Carthaginian force at Drëpāna, 93 ships out of 123 being taken; another fleet of 120 was wrecked. Finally, the Romans again built 200 quinqueremes by voluntary effort, and the victory of Q. Lutatius Catulus at the Aegātes Insulae in 241 ended the war. The fleet-numbers of 300 and over are, however, probably exaggerations, due perhaps to the inclusion of transports. For instance, in the first storm, after Hermaea, the Romans are said to have had 364 ships, being the fleet of Hermaea plus 114 prizes; the fleet then at Hermaea was about 250, at Ecnomus consequently 230. So the Carthaginians, supposed to have had 250 ships left after Ecnomus, are said to have been compelled to build in a hurry to get 200 to sea in the following year. Rome, in fact, won because, with her greater resources, she everywhere (except possibly at Ecnomus) managed to oppose to

The commanders.

Ships supplied by Italic towns.

First Punic war.

Carthage a superior force, keeping up a fleet of from 220 to 250 ships while Carthage's maximum was about 200. Boarding, too, had gone on for centuries without the marvellous *κόραξ*, while grapnels (*χεῖρες σιδηραῖ*) had been known as early as 413, when the Athenians used them against the Syracusans; and the *κόραξ* was probably only an improved grapnel on a pole, something like Agrippa's *ἄκραξ*, with which in Appian it seems to be synonymous. Rome lost some 500 ships in this war, Carthage about 450.

758. On the outbreak of the second Punic war, the Romans sent out 220 quinqueremes; but it soon became clear that Carthage would not fight at sea, and, under the pressure of circumstances, the Romans evolved something like separate standing-squadrons with permanent commanders. By 208 the 35 ships originally sent to Spain had, with captures and reinforcements, grown to 80; this squadron, based on Tarrāco, was under P. Scipio till his death; then, under Africanus. The squadron of Sicily, based on Lilybaeum, was under T. Otacilius Crassus as praetor and propraetor from 217 till his death in 211, thenceforward to 206 under M. Valerius Laevinus as consul and proconsul; from 214 to 206 its strength was 100 ships. The Adriatic squadron, 50 strong, based on Brundisium to watch Philip, was under the same Valerius, as praetor and propraetor, from 215 to 211, and thenceforward, to 206, under P. Sulpicius Galba, as consul and proconsul. These three squadrons gave a standing fleet of 200 to 230 ships. In 208, consequent on a rumour that Carthage was equipping a fleet 200 strong, Rome actually had 280 ships at sea, viz.:—Sicily 100, Adriatic 50, Italy 50 (new), Spain 30, Sardinia 50 (drawn from Spain). In 208 and 207 Valerius defeated inferior Carthaginian fleets; this enabled Rome in 206 to lay up part of the Sicilian squadron; the Adriatic squadron was laid up soon after, on peace with Philip; by 203 the fleet at sea had sunk to 160. The story of the great voluntary effort made in 205 to build 30 warships to enable Scipio to cross to Africa is thus either legendary or refers solely to the collection of transport. In 202, the Romans, in accordance with their usual practice, burnt the surrendered Carthaginian ships.

Second Punic war.

759. For the war with Antiochus 100 new quinqueremes were ordered to be built and 30 old ones refitted, but the number was never completed; for Rome, who had refused the help of Hiero's navy against Carthage, now relied largely on her allies; in this war she supplied 75 ships only and the treaty towns 31 (including 6 Carthaginian) against 50 of Eumenes and 77 of Rhodes; she even accepted help from Mytilene and Erythraea. At Cōrȳcus in 191 106 ships under the praetor C. Livius Salinator (81 cataphracts), with 50 of Eumenes, defeated Polyxenidas with 100 ships (70 cataphracts) and perhaps 100 light craft; after this the Rhodians did most of the fighting, even deciding the final battle, Myonnēsus, in which the praetor L. Aemilius Regillus, with 58 Roman and 22 Rhodian cataphracts, defeated Polyxenidas

War with Antiochus.

with 90, perhaps the only sea-fight of importance fought by the Roman navy against odds. Against Perseus, and for the third war against Carthage, 50 old quinqueremes were refitted, while the Greeks of Asia sent contingents. The old navy never fought another action after the fall of Carthage. The Roman squadron in the Social war was furnished by the Asiatic Greeks. Against Mithradates Sulla had no fleet at all; Lucullus risked his life to beg ships in Egypt and Asia. In the second war Lucullus with 100 ships succeeded in driving Mithradates from the sea, but all the ships were Greek. Though Rome was possibly never without ships, the idea of a national navy was dead; and, with the abolition by Sulla of the standing consular command over Italy, the basis of that navy, the general sea-command, also vanished.

760. In the first Punic war one or both of the consuls in person still commanded the fleet. In 218 both consuls again put to sea; but Hannibal's presence in Italy ended this arrangement;

The commanders.

and down to 211 the fleets of Sicily and the Adriatic formed sometimes separate provinces, sometimes parts of the provinces of Sicily and Greece, and were commanded by praetors or propraeors, these commands being independent of the consuls whose (limited) provinces meanwhile were in Italy. But, after 211, when the worst pressure was over, the fleets were again commanded by consuls or proconsuls, who sometimes deputed the command to a *praefectus*, as Scipio to Laelius and Valerius in 210 to M. Valerius Messalla. The Roman system led at least once to a fleet having no legitimate commander, when in 202 the consul, Tib. Claudius Nero, whose *imperium* expired on service and was not prolonged, brought home his squadron as a private person; but the standing commands of 215 and onward show the sound sense of the men who administered the system. In the war with Antiochus the fleet was commanded by the praetor to whom it fell by lot; but, as the province of the consul directing operations was not now limited, the praetor had no longer an independent command, as from 215 to 211, but was subordinate to the consul because acting in his province of which the sea formed part; hence Liuius is called *praefectus classis*, the real admiral being the consul. Liuius seems to have remained in command of a few ships in 190, probably as *praefectus* of Regillus; for that the praetor in command of the fleet, though in one sense *praefectus* of the consul, could appoint his own *praefectus*, is shown in the war with Perseus (171), when the praetor, C. Lucretius, so appointed his brother. The link between the commands in the second Punic and the Syrian wars is formed by that of the propraeor L. Quinctius Flamininus in the war against Philip; he was appointed by the Senate in 198 and commanded the fleet throughout, but is called the *praefectus* of his brother the consul, who nominated him. In 192, 20 ships being sent to guard Sicily, the Senate decreed *ut cum imperio esset qui classem eam duceret*; a commander was selected who held no other



office. These precedents were to receive an enormous development after Sulla.

761. A fleet required rowers (*rēmiges*), sailors (*nautae*), and marine troops (*milites classici*). Unlike the Athenian or Macedonian, no Roman ever handled an oar. The allies and maritime colonies supplied oarsmen and sailors; and *socii nauales* became so stereotyped a phrase for 'crew' (oarsmen and sailors *both*), that it is even used of crews of Carthage, Rhodes, and Syria. After 217 *libertini* were also used in the crews, and the navy became more and more dependent upon them. In 191 eight maritime colonies attempted to claim a *vacatio* from naval service; and, in that year, and in 181, 20 ships were manned solely by *libertini*. In 172 the crews consisted of *socii* and *libertini* in equal proportions; in 171 and 169 the new levies were all *libertini*. In the stress of the Hannibalian war, slaves were requisitioned as rowers (214 and 210); while, after the capture of New Carthage, Scipio manned some ships with Spanish captives. Crews were often armed and used as land-troops. The service was unpopular; considerable desertions occurred in 214 and 198. The captain (*magister navis*) and steersman (*gubernator*) were *ingenui*; the latter, judging from two distributions of prize-money in 176, appears to have ranked with a centurion. The marine troops were generally drawn from the Roman proletariat, the so-called 6th class; though *socii* and Latins are mentioned in 192. For a battle they were often stiffened with picked legionaries; it is noticeable, however, that, in the dispute over the mural crown at the taking of New Carthage, the marine troops sided with the crews against the land-army. Their organisation is obscure; it must, however, have been on a military basis, as we hear of tribunes in command in 190 (who cannot have belonged to the land-army), and again in Caesar's fleet. As centurions commanded ships under Caesar, and as the average of marine troops to a quinquereme seems to have been from about 100 to 70 (120 at Ecnomus was exceptional), it may be that the imperial organisation of the troops of each ship, as a century under a centurion, merely reproduced an older arrangement. The *legio classica* mentioned in 216 may have been a legion formed from *classici* for land-service.

762. The standard warship was the quinquereme, though quadriremes and triremes also fought in the line. The fleets of quinqueremes (so-called) of the 3rd century were not all quinqueremes, though these ships were the great majority; they formed 88% of the Carthaginian fleet of Spain in 218, as we know from Hannibal's own figures. Except possibly *pentekontors*, vessels lighter than triremes probably took no part in fleet-actions in the 3rd century, though *lembi* appear as scouts. But, after Philip V had, in 201, demonstrated the capabilities of the Illyrian or beaked *lembos*, light ships became a regular part of a fleet; the Romans acquired 20 Illyrian (Issaeon) *lembi* in 200; in 198 they had 30, in 171 they added 22 others; in 146 they used 100 *hēmīōliai*, perhaps Greek. Of the great ships that formed the strength of Hellenistic navies,

Rome adopted only the *hexēres*; at Ecnomus the consuls had one each, as flagship (*praetoria navis*), and Scipio one in 205. Envoys, commissioners, or messengers of victory were always given quinqueremes. The equipment of the fleet, originally the business of the consuls, is found entrusted, sometimes to a praetor chosen by lot, in 208 to the urban praetor, in 192 to the urban and foreign praetors. The selection of the urban praetor seems to show that the Romans built on the Tiber. Roughly speaking, the Romans kept the battle-fleet of quinqueremes in their own hands, depending on the treaty-towns and allies for lighter vessels.

763. The Roman trireme was doubtless the same as the Greek. For details, see Mr Cook's article 'Ships' in the *Companion to Greek Studies*; the evidence appears to support the view, that the trireme was more or less analogous to the Venetian trireme with grouped oars there described, and that the Greek quinquereme of the 4th century was similarly arranged. But this will hardly apply to the quinqueremes of the 3rd century and onwards. The view generally held is, that a quinquereme had five banks of oars one over the other. But the practical difficulties of this are hopeless; and the theory itself would probably never have been framed but for the belief that in classical times more than one man never rowed one oar,—a belief without any foundation as regards vessels larger than triremes. The upholders of this theory, too, do not agree in their explanations of the fact that (as the German writers frankly admit) a quinquereme had only three classes of rowers like a trireme. A more moderate view, well stated by Dr Bauer, holds that a quinquereme had three tiers of oars close together, the oars of the two upper tiers rowed by two men apiece. Yet another theory, never without supporters, holds that a quinquereme had five men to each oar, and was in this respect analogous to the mediaeval quinquereme, described in Furtenbach's *Architectura Navalis* (1620 A.D.), and by Jurien de la Gravière; and this seems to be the theory that best squares with the available evidence.

764. A quinquereme then was a comparatively light galley of shallow draught and low free-board, probably propelled by a single row of long oars with five men to each. The rowers were probably in three squads, as at Venice; *thrānītes* astern, *zūgītes* amidships, *thālāmītes* forward. Polybius gives the crew as 300, possibly 25 oars a side (evolved ultimately from the *pentekontor*) and 50 sailors etc.; but, as this latter figure seems large, a quinquereme may sometimes have admitted 26 or 27 oars a side, as did her mediaeval namesake; and the oarsmen must have rowed a similar stroke, rising on their feet coming forward, and flinging themselves back with a jerk, for Appian refers to inexperienced rowers being unable to keep their feet in a sea. She had some form of outrigger (*παρεξερσία*) for giving sufficient leverage and equalising it, as in the Venetian galleys; she had a ram shod with bronze, and two masts and sails, of which the larger was, if possible, sent ashore before action, the smaller (*dōlōn*) retained; she was

The Roman trireme.

The quinquereme.

heavier and normally slower than a trireme. Over the rowers' heads was a deck, on which stood the troops (*propugnatores*) protected by bulwarks (*propugnacula*), and by two wooden turrets (*turres*, *πύργοι*), carried on supports (*πυργόσχοι*) built into the ship, but themselves removable; these, however, are not mentioned on Roman ships before the Civil wars, though the Greeks had them by 240. Unlike the trireme, which was sometimes built as a cataphract (*navis tecta, constrata*) and sometimes not (*aperta*), the quinquereme was always a cataphract; *i.e.* the ship's side, instead of stopping at the gunwale, was carried up to the deck above to protect the motive power (rowers) from missiles, thus corresponding to the modern armoured vessel. The dimensions and tonnage of a quinquereme are unknown. Like the trireme, she could be hauled ashore anywhere, though not so easily.

765. The destruction or decline of other navies, and the virtual abdication of Rome, left the sea open to organised piracy, with which Rome was finally forced to deal. As the old sea-command no longer existed, an extraordinary command, *imperium infinitum aequum*, was in 74 given by senatorial decree to M. Antonius, father of the triumvir; but his force was inadequate, and, in 67, the *Lex Gābīnia* bestowed a similar command for three years upon Pompey.

The new navy.

Pompey.

This command, which in effect restored the old unlimited consular *imperium*, made the holder absolute at sea, and of equal authority with the several proconsular governors along the coasts; while the same law gave Pompey's 25 squadron-leaders the rank of propraetor. Pompey collected or built 200 ships with rams (*rostratae*) and 70 *hēmīōlīai*; he cleared the sea for a time, taking 377 ships (90 *rostratae*). He himself, by counting in everything that floated, claimed 846, which at his triumph figured as 800 bronze-beaked ships. Rome now possessed a navy of nearly 300 beaked ships.

766. Sulla's reforms had not abolished the old authority of each provincial governor over the sea bordering his province; in virtue of this authority, Caesar built a fleet in Gaul, appointed a *praefectus*, and in a noteworthy battle destroyed the ocean-going leather-sailed ships of the Vēnēti, 220 strong. In 49 he built and stationed two fleets in the Tyrrhene and Adriatic seas. Yet, in 48, he controlled some 150 ships only, against over 300 of Pompey (which included 50 Egyptian and 20 Rhodian); nevertheless, he crossed the Adriatic. Some 200 ships perished in his campaigns; he acquired what remained of Pompey's fleet, though, with a few ships, Pompey's younger son, Sextus, maintained himself as a sea-rover. Caesar had perhaps 200 ships when murdered in 44. On this event the notion of a republican State-fleet revived; the Senate sent for Sextus Pompeius and gave him the extraordinary office of *praefectus classis et orae maritimae*, with power to employ Roman ships wherever found; in Appian's phrase, he was chosen to rule the sea, as his father had ruled it before him. He established himself

Caesar

The State-fleet revived.

Sextus Pompeius.

in Sicily and collected what ships he could; but part of the fleet adhered to Antony. When the Senate subsequently regularised the position of Brutus and Cassius by giving them the *imperium infinitum maius*, an extraordinary command that made them absolute at sea and superior on the coasts to all provincial governors, Sextus must have been technically superseded; anyhow, he soon played for his own hand. In 42 he had

Brutus and  
Cassius.

130 ships, based on Messana; Brutus and Cassius, who had built and obtained ships in Asia, where Cassius had destroyed the Rhodian navy at Myndus, had 150 under Staius Murcus

and Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, and perhaps others; the triumvirs had 60 only, 60 others sent by Cleopatra having been wrecked. Nevertheless, the triumvirs crossed the Adriatic; division after division of transports slipped past Murcus; that he finally destroyed a squadron on the very day

The fiction of a  
State-fleet  
comes to an  
end.

of Philippi was immaterial. After Philippi the republican fleet broke up; Murcus with 80 or more ships joined Sextus; Ahenobarbus with 70, after burning Octavian's ships in Brundisium and for a while ruling the Adriatic as a sea-

king, went over to Antony; and the fiction of a fleet of the State came to an end.

767. In 40 Sextus had 230 ships, Antony (who had built largely in Asia) 270, Octavian none. To crush Sextus, Octavian built two fleets, in Rome (under Calvisius Sabinus) and Ravenna:

Octavian.

but they were defeated in turn by the Pompeians and finally half destroyed in a storm. Octavian thereupon exacted huge contributions from the wealthy, spent largely himself, and raised his fleet to some 370 ships; Calvisius was superseded by Agrippa. That able man joined the Avernian and Lucrine lakes to each other and the sea, forming the Julian harbour, and here during the winter of 37—36 he severely trained his fleet. The ships, which included several *hexēreis*, were built taller and stronger than usual, and were equipped with turrets and catapults, and with Agrippa's new grapnel on a pole (*ἄρπαξ*). Another 130 ships were obtained from Antony and Octavia in exchange for troops, and were stationed at Tarentum under Taurus; Lepidus was to cooperate from Africa with 70. Sextus also built, and had about 300 ships, lighter than Octavian's; in 36 nearly 1000 warships were in commission for the greatest naval campaign of antiquity. Agrippa and Taurus sailed together. Agrippa, after losing some 70 ships (including a *hexēres*) in a storm, defeated off Mylae Sextus' admiral Papias, who lost 30 out of 155; but Sextus himself defeated Octavian and Taurus at Tauromēnium, 70 ships only escaping. Finally, on 3 September, 36, was fought the decisive battle of Naulöchus. It is said that each side had 300 ships in action; Agrippa probably had, but Sextus can hardly have had over 250, as his 155 at Mylae are called the larger part of his fleet, and 30 were lost there. The battle was a desperate *mêlée*, the war-paint alone distinguishing friend from foe; Sextus was utterly defeated.



768. With 163 ships taken from Sextus and 70 from Lepidus, Octavian in 31 had 500 ships. Taurus' 70 had been returned to Antony, giving him 240; he built largely, tradition says up to 500. But his press-gangs failed to man them; at Actium, after preliminary losses and after burning a number, he had 170 only (exclusive of Cleopatra's 60) carrying 22,000 troops, about 130 per ship, a very high figure. Octavian had anything up to 400 ships, carrying about 35,000 troops.

769. Little is known of the crews of this period. Caesar used Gauls as rowers. Sextus' fleet was manned by his father's old seamen from Spain and Africa, and by fugitive slaves, and was commanded by Greek freedmen. Octavian in 36 had 20,000 manumitted slaves at the oar. The Roman proletariat, now recruited for the legions, was no longer equally available for marine troops. Antony's legion XVII *classica* was perhaps marines; but, both in 36 and 31, each side must largely have employed regular legionaries on board.

The crews.

770. Two new warships appear in the first century B.C.; the bireme, scarcely found earlier and never common; and the Liburnian, originally a swift Illyrian *mōnērēs* with a ram, similar to, if not identical with, the Illyrian *lembos*. The Romans built Liburnians also as biremes, but their Liburnians were not all necessarily such. They were used both for scouting and fighting. Sextus had one and Octavian several *hexereis*, but the proportion of quinqueremes to triremes in a fleet was probably smaller than in the old navy. In 37 a new principle appears. Class for class, Octavian's ships were bigger than heretofore; and Antony deliberately outbuilt him. Antony's fleet, comprising all classes from *dekēreis* downwards, was frankly Hellenistic; but the ships, taller and stronger than their Hellenistic forerunners and fitted for heavy catapults, perhaps already approximated to the type of the mediaeval galleasse. Circumstances prevented further development on these lines.

The bireme and the Liburnian.

771. In eighteen years prior to 31 nearly 1000 ships perished. Augustus' claim to have captured 600 warships, not counting light craft, may be difficult to substantiate; but he remained sole master of the sea with some 700 vessels, his own property; with truth he speaks of 'my fleet'. He saw that, to keep down piracy and ensure Rome's corn-supply, a standing fleet was necessary, and that this fleet, in the emperor's hands, might be an invaluable support to the principate. He therefore formed two permanent fleets, based on Misenum and Ravenna, to guard the western and eastern seas respectively; he connected Ravenna with the river Po by a canal (*fossa Augusti*); he manned Antony's ships and stationed them at Forum Iuli (*Fréjus*), where they took part in the Cantabrian war. His crews and captains were slaves or freedmen, members of his *familia*; even the praefects were freedmen. But, as the ships wore out, they were not replaced; by 6 A.D. piracy again made both seas unsafe. The military organisation of the imperial standing fleets dates from Tiberius

Augustus.

or Claudius. It succeeded; and, by Trajan's time, piracy was banished (temporarily) from the Mediterranean.

772. The Imperial standing fleets, prior to 180 A.D., are as follows:—

A. Italian. (1) The fleet of Misenum, *Classis praetoria Misenensis*; base, Misenum; probable squadron-stations, Centumcellae, Ostia, Puteoli, Baiae, Capreae (under Tiberius); Carales (*Cagliari*) in Sardinia; Aleria and Mariana (?) in Corsica; Piraeus (?); possibly others. (2) The fleet of Ravenna, *Classis praetoria Rauennas*; base, Ravenna; probable stations, Aquileia, Brundisium, Centumcellae, Piraeus (?); possibly others.

The stations in common at Centumcellae and Piraeus show that each fleet might operate in the other's sphere. When the Senate took over Gallia Narbonensis in 22 B.C., the fleet at *Fréjus*, which existed still in 69 A.D., was probably reduced and made a squadron of the *Classis Misenensis*, no separate praefects of this fleet being known. Claudius employed *classarii* (marine troops) of the *Classis Rauennas* to drain Lake Fūcinus; they had a station there, probably till Hadrian's time. Both fleets fought in 69, first for Otho and then for Vespasian against Vitellius. Nero formed the legion I *Adiutrix* from the Misenate *classarii*, Otho or Vespasian the legion II *Adiutrix* from the Ravennate. The *cohortes classicae*, one of which dates from Augustus, may have been similarly formed. Up to 71 both fleet-names occur without the title *praetoria*, which first appears in 127; the occasion of its origin is not known, but it distinguishes the Italian from the provincial fleets as being in closer relation to the emperor, just as the praetorian cohorts were distinguished from the legions. These fleets gave the emperor, with his provincial *imperium*, a firm footing in Italy, even in Rome; for, at some time between Vespasian and Commodus, detachments of *classarii* from both fleets were stationed in the city, the Misenates in the 3rd *regio* near the Coliseum, the awning over which was their charge, the Ravennates in the 14th. Both fleets began to take the emperor's name under the Antonines, as is shown by the title *Antoniniana*; the addition of *pia uindex* belongs to the 3rd century.

B. Provincial. (1) The Egyptian fleet, *Classis Augusta Alexandrina*; base, Alexandria; station, Caesarea in Mauretania (in common with *Classis Syriaca*). The title *Augusta* goes back to the middle of the 1st century; the fleet must date from Augustus. (2) The Syrian fleet, *Classis Syriaca*; base, Seleucia in Pieria. It took part in Vespasian's Jewish war. (3) The Libyan fleet, *Classis Noua Libyca*; founded probably under Marcus Aurelius and based in the Cyrenaica. (4) The Euxine fleet, *Classis Pontica*; base, Trapezus; probably dates from Nero. Ἀκρόσση Περὶ θῆλα, mentioned in 92, is probably a separate Thracian squadron. (5) and (6) The Danube fleets, *Classis Pannonica* on the middle, *Classis Moesica* on the lower, river; various stations along the Danube and Save. These fleets, probably dating from Augustus, whose flotillas fought on the Save in 34 B.C., took part in the wars of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, and received the name

*Flavia* from one of the Flavian emperors. (7) The Rhine fleet, *Classis Germanica*: various stations along the river, among them probably Moguntiācum (*Mayence*) with docks, Bonna (*Bonn*), and the ancient site marked by the large ruins of *Altenburg* near Cologne. This fleet was formed by Drusus, who cut a canal for it from the Rhine to the Zuyder Zee (*fossa Drusi*): under him in 12 B.C. it reached the Ems, defeating a flotilla of the Bructēri; under Tiberius in 5 A.D. it went as far as the Elbe. In 46 under Corbulo it sank a pirate-fleet of the Chauci. In Saturninus' revolt in 89 it remained faithful to Domitian, receiving in return the titles *pia fidelis Domitiana*, and *Augusta*. (8) The British fleet, *Classis Britannica*; base, Gesoriācum (*Boulogne*); stations, possibly Dubrae (*Dover*), Portus Lēmānae (*Lymne*), Glēuum (*Gloucester*). It dates perhaps from Claudius' invasion. It aided Agricola in his Scottish expedition in 83, circumnavigated Britain, discovered the Orkneys, and saw 'Thule', the long line of the outer Hebrides. The *classiarii* helped to build Hadrian's wall. No fleet-station is known in Spain. Particular squadrons were fitted out, on the Red Sea in 24 B.C. by Aelius Gallus to invade the Yemen; on Lake Constance by Tiberius against the Vindelici; and on the Euphrates in Trajan's Parthian war.

773. The emperor was head of all the fleets. Each was commanded by a praefectus (ἐπαρχος στόλου, *stolarchus*) appointed by him, and had also a sub-praefectus. It appears from recorded promotions that the Misenate praefect ranked before the Ravennate, and both before the provincial. The praefects, of equestrian rank, were generally chosen, the provincial from the categories of *tribuni militum* and *praefecti alarum*, the Italian from the provincial or from procurators of provinces: but three Misenate praefects are known to have been freedmen, Tib. Iulius Optatus Pontianus under Claudius, Anicetus under Nero, Moschus under Otho. Under Vitellius, Sextus Lucilius Bassus held the praefecture of both Italian fleets. Many names are known; the elder Pliny was Misenate praefect in 79, when he perished in the eruption of Vesuvius; under M. Aurelius, the future emperor P. Helvius Pertinax was praefect of the Rhine fleet. The Egyptian fleet-praefect was sometimes also praefect of the Nile revenue-boats (*pōtāmō-phŷlāciae*) and perhaps under the intermediate authority of the praefect of Egypt, no doubt with reference to the convoy of the Egyptian corn-ships. Commanders.

774. Each ship, of whatever size, was commanded by a trierarch, generally (after Augustus) a citizen. A trierarch occasionally commanded several ships, doubtless as senior captain. The *classiarii* of each ship were organised as a century (larger no doubt in some ships than others) under a fleet-centurion (*centurio classicus*), so that on landing the men had their organisation ready; and, as the *gubernator* formed part of the century and was thus under the centurion, while the trierarch had some authority over the troops, each ship apparently had two independent commanders, an almost incredible Trierarchs and nauarchs.

arrangement, due perhaps to land-fighting only being expected and to the *classiarii* spending half the year ashore. A decree of Antoninus Pius enabled trierarchs to rise to be nauarchs and military centurions. The nauarch was probably the commander of a squadron of a fleet (*uexillatio classica*). That he ranked below a military centurion, extraordinary as it is, perhaps only illustrates the low esteem in which naval service was held, a state of things which led to perpetual agitation among the *classiarii* to be made regular legionaries. A decree of Antoninus Pius gave nauarchs the rank of centurion, a decree of Marcus Aurelius and Verus that of decurion. Numerous other officers are known.

775. The *classiarii* were generally free *peregrini*. Hadrian gave them

Crews. Latin rights; while, on their discharge (*honesta missio*), they

received citizenship and *connubium*. Down to 180 A.D. the ordinary term of service was 26 years, except under Trajan, when it was 25. The Ravennates came largely from Pannonia and Dalmatia. Of the Misenates, so far as their country is known, Pannonia and Dalmatia supplied 9%, Sardinia and Corsica 9%, the Bessi 18%, Asia 28%, Africa (with Egypt) 29%; one German occurs, but no Spaniard, Gaul, or Briton. For most purposes the *rēmiges* appear not to be distinguished from the *classiarii*.

776. The numbers of the Imperial fleets are unknown, except that the Euxine fleet once numbered 40 vessels. Three *hexēreis* occur; but the trireme has now completely displaced the quinquereme (no sea-fighting being anticipated), while of lighter vessels the Liburnian alone survives. Taking Misenate ships whose names are known, we have 1 *hexērēs*, 1 quinquereme, 10 quadriremes, 56 triremes and 14 Liburnians. The use of 'Liburnian', for warships generally, is much later.

777. After the first Punic war, the capacity of the Roman government can largely be measured by its attitude to the sea.

Roman sea-power.

The national standing fleets of the Hannibalian war were an effort worthy of the time; they held off Carthage and Philip, and enabled Rome, aided here by Marseilles, to control the sea-route between Hannibal and Spain. In the Syrian war the decadence of the fleet already followed that of the government; Rome began to rely on Greek allies, a process that steadily grew until at Rome's nadir, the first Mithradatic war she had no pretence of a navy left. The sea had to be reconquered; but the fleet raised was cosmopolitan, and its allegiance tended to be personal to its commander, Pompey; it foreshadowed the Empire. In the struggles of the next 36 years success followed those who had, and could use, sea-power. Caesar hardly grasped this; hence his career was twice all but cut short: at Ilerda, where the naval victory of Decimus Brutus over the Massiliots alone saved him, and at Alexandria. Both the liberators and Antony possessed many ships; both failed in their use. But Caesar's son was forced by Pompey's son to turn to the sea; his two decisive battles were fought on the water; the last independent



navy vanished; and Augustus attained to sole mastery of the Mediterranean and all its warships, a firm support for the Principate. The Empire, while strong, adhered to the tradition of its founder; but interest shifts from the Mediterranean to the frontiers, to the Danube in the Dacian and Marcomannic and to the Euphrates and Tigris in Trajan's Parthian wars; there ships bridged the rivers, transported troops and supplies, formed and guarded communications. But the greatest task fell to the Rhine-fleet in the North Sea; it alone encountered fleets of the enemy; it rendered enormous aid to Drusus and Tiberius in their invasions of Germany, while Germanicus' expedition of 16 A.D. was entirely transported by water. The complete failure of Rome against Germany, in these circumstances, usefully illustrates the limitations of sea-power.

*The old navy.* Ground-work in Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*<sup>3</sup>. *First Punic war*; W. W. Tarn, *Journ. Hell. Studies* (1907), p. 48. *Civil wars*; J. Kromayer, *Philologus*, 1897, p. 426, *Hermes*, 1899, p. 1 (Actium). *Imperial navy*; O. Fiebiger, *classis* in Pauly-Wissowa, with references down to 1899; E. Ferrero, *Nuove Inscrizioni*, etc. (*Memorie d. Acad.*, Torino, 1900, pp. 165—333), with excellent indexes to the author's earlier works and to the inscriptions; O. Hirschfeld, *die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungs-beamten*<sup>2</sup>, 1905, p. 225. *The ships*. Orthodox theory; E. Assmann, *Seewesen in Baumeister*; E. Lübeck, *das Seewesen der Griechen und Römer* (1890); E. Warre, *navis* in Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.* (1891); C. Torr, *Ancient Ships* (1894), and *navis* in Daremberg and Saglio. The German and English views differ. Other theories; A. Bauer, *Griech. Kriegsalterthümer*, in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*; A. B. Cook, *Ships*, in the *Companion to Greek Studies*; A. B. Cook and Wigham Richardson in *Class. Rev.* XIX (1905), p. 371; W. W. Tarn in *Journ. Hell. Studies* (1905), pp. 137, 204, and in *Class. Rev.* XX 75. Bibliography.

## VI. 15. ROMAN PUBLIC GAMES (*LUDI PUBLICI*).

778. *Ludus* is a general term which (1) includes the spectacles of the theatre (*ludi scaenici*) and (2) the contests and spectacles of the circus, the amphitheatre and the stadium (*ludi circenses*). Early games. But the gladiatorial displays are more properly *munera*, and athletic and musical contests *agōnes* (ἀγῶνες).

The Roman *fēriæ* included the two conceptions of rest from labour (*otium*) and of sport (*ludus*) intended to promote enjoyment. Originally the games were religious ceremonies. All *ludi* were at least originally adjuncts to religious festivals out of which they had gradually grown. The special usages connected with the different festivals had a religious meaning and are to be regarded as symbolical. The earliest games were races in connexion with the festival of a deity. Such were the *Consualia* (at which the Rape of the Sabines took place, Liv. i 9) a harvest festival at the *ara Consi*, and the *Equirria* in honour of Mars in the Campus Martius. Even

in the imperial period the *fratres aruāles* held the games of *Dea Dia* in the grove of that goddess.

779. But the early priestly games are clearly distinguished from the great games of the Republic, which fell to the State-officials and which, though part of a definite *cultus*, took place, not at a special altar or sanctuary, but in the Circus. The old sacerdotal games were ascribed to Romulus or Numa; for the oldest of the magisterial games the highest antiquity claimed was Tarquinius Priscus (Liv. i 35, Cic. *de Rep.* ii 36). In the early days of the Republic the people were content with a single festival, the national *ludi Romani*, and a single circus. But, towards the end of the third century B.C., there was a great increase in public amusements. The early games, with the exception of the older *ludi Romani*, date from the critical years of the war with Hannibal. Gaius Flaminius added a second festival, the *ludi plebei*, and a second circus, B.C. 220. The *Cerealia*, the festival of the goddess who protected the *plebs*, belongs to the same period—before B.C. 202. The *ludi Apollinares* were introduced in 212, the *ludi Megalenses* in 204; the *Floralia* were rather later, viz. in 173. These were all State-festivals, at which the games were managed and provided by the magistrates to whom the festivals severally fell: the *ludi Romani*, the *Megalēsia* and the *Floralia* by the curule aediles; the *ludi plebei* and the *Cerealia* by the plebeian aediles (until Iulius Caesar appointed aediles *Cereales*, to whom the *Cerealia* were committed, B.C. 46); the *ludi Apollinares* by the *praetor urbanus*. The consuls were expected to give some show during their year of office. From B.C. 22, when Augustus transferred the *cura ludorum* from the aediles to the praetors, games given by the aediles were voluntary. Games vowed by a magistrate or general in the name of the State were celebrated by the official who vowed the games. The heavy expense thus entailed made ability to bear the cost a necessary qualification for office. Rivalry between competitors led to great expenditure upon the shows, until, finally, a candidate constantly gave a voluntary exhibition, especially a gladiatorial display, in addition to the regular *ludi*. These extravagances were the subject of legislation in the time of Cicero.

780. To the six festivals already named there were added *ludi Victoriae Sullanae*, B.C. 82, and *ludi Victoriae Caesaris* (also called *ludi Veneris Genetricis*), B.C. 46. These regular festivals were originally of one day each. But days were added (e.g. a day was added to the *ludi Romani* after each of the great revolutions in B.C. 509, 494 and 367), until at the close of the Republic these *ludi statui* occupied 76 days. And this reckoning does not include gladiatorial displays and many extraordinary amusements. In the imperial period, as will be seen below (§ 791), many new games were added, so that the Calendar of Philocalus, about A.D. 354, gives 175 days of *ludi* in the year.

781. Still further there were periodic festivals, like the *ludi saeculares*, and various *ludi priuati*, of which *ludi funebres* were the most important.

There were also games in connexion with triumphs, games offered by men of wealth and rank on occasions of public rejoicing and many private exhibitions, especially those given by the emperors, to which invitations were issued. The emperor gave, or supported, *ludi* by an act of personal liberality. The ordinary games remained in the hands of the magistrates. Extraordinary games, so far as they were voted by the Senate, fell to the consuls; *ludi scaenici* and *ludi circenses* from B.C. 22 to the praetors, *munera gladiatorum* to the quaestors. *Ludi priuati* were organised and managed by the givers, but the aediles exercised a general right of control, which was the more reasonable as these games were very often held in the Forum Romanum or the Forum Boarium.

782. Public games were given at Rome by State-officials in performance of a vow; to appease the divine wrath when calamity had befallen; at the dedication of a temple or public building. These were *ludi extraordinarii*. The annual games (*sollemnes*) were, for the most part, in the first instance extraordinary. Thus the *ludi Apollinares* were vowed and given for the first time in B.C. 212 after the defeat at Cannae and were definitely constituted a fixed annual festival B.C. 208 (Liv. xxv 12, xxvi 23, xxvii 23): the *ludi Florales* date back to B.C. 238 or 240, but did not become annual until 173 (Ovid, *Fast.* v 327). Many *ludi extraordinarii* were given once only, e.g. the games *tumultus causa uoti* by the dictator A. Postumius Tubertus, B.C. 431 (Liv. iv 27); the games vowed by the dictator M. Furius Camillus, B.C. 396, celebrated by the consuls after the fall of Veii, 392 (Liv. v 19 and 31); and others (Liv. vii 11, xxviii 38 and 45, xxxv 1, xxxvi 36, etc.). From the circumstances, in which they were undertaken, such games are frequently termed *ludi uotivi*. After a victory or a deliverance, games were a solemn act of thanksgiving to the gods. Thus, after the departure of the Gauls from Rome, the dictator, M. Furius Camillus, had a *senatus consultum*, ordering the celebration of the *ludi Capitolini*, passed, *quod Iuppiter Optimus Maximus suam sedem atque arcem populi Romani in re trepida tutatus esset* (Liv. v 50).

783. The oldest games, the *Consualia* and *Equirria*, were horse-races and chariot-races. Tarquinius Priscus appears to have added athletics, since he brought *pūgiles*, as well as race-horses, from Etruria (Liv. i 35), but athletics found little favour at Rome. On the occasion of a pestilence in B.C. 364, *ludi scaenici* were added to appease the anger of the gods. See *Theatrum* (§ 800). These were mimic dances accompanied by the flute but without words. Regular dramatic performances begin with Livius Andronicus B.C. 240 (Liv. vii 2). From that date, *ludi scaenici* acquired great importance; they were added to the Circus-games at the *ludi Romani*, constituted almost the whole of the *ludi Apollinares* and the *Megalēsia*, and were the essential part of the *Floralia*. Scenic performances were also given in *ludi extraordinarii* and in *ludi priuati*, especially *ludi funebres*, e.g. Terence's *Hecyra* was performed at a funeral display.

Different kinds  
of games.

784. The gladiatorial shows, like the scenic exhibitions, were borrowed by the Romans from Etruria. Gladiators appeared first in funeral games; the earliest recorded exhibition was that given B.C. 264 by Marcus and Decimus Brutus at the funeral of their father (Val. Max. ii 4, 7). Gladiatorial displays quickly caught the popular fancy and the combats became more and more frequent. Accordingly, such *munera* were recognised as a ready means of gaining popular favour and were lavishly employed by candidates for office. The first official exhibition was given by the consuls P. Rutilius Rufus and C. Manlius, B.C. 105. The abuse of gladiatorial *munera* by candidates was limited by the *Lex Tullia de ambitu*, B.C. 63.

785. Contests in the Greek style (*ἀγῶνες*) were introduced at Rome during the closing period of the Republic. These *agōnes* and the mimic sea-fights, *naumachiae*, will be treated separately at the end of this article (§ 797 f). To complete the list of spectacles included under the head of *ludi* it is necessary to name the wild-beast shows, *uēnātiōnes*, mimes, pyrrhic dances, the *ludus Troiae* performed by boys on horseback. Suetonius (*Iul.* 39), in describing the displays given by Caesar, B.C. 46, gives a practically complete list of the *ludi* then in vogue.

786. In early days no festival at Rome passed the limits of a single day. This was the case with the *Equirria* (February 27th and March 14th) and the *Consualia* (August 21st and December 15th), when they were repeated twice each year. But the duration of the games was gradually prolonged, and, towards the close of the Republic, the state of things stands as follows.

(1) *Ludi Romani* or *Magni*, September 4th—18th, *i.e.* 15 days, or 16 after the death of Caesar in whose honour a day was added. The games were in honour of Iuppiter; they were preceded by a solemn procession (*pompā*) from the Capitol, through the Forum Romanum and the Velabrum to the Circus Maximus. The games were *scaenici* and *circenses*. There was an *epulum Iouis* on September 13th, an *equorum probatio* on September 14th. They occupy only four days in the *Fasti Philocali*.

(2) *Ludi Plebeiī*, November 4th—17th, *i.e.* 14 days. The festival is probably much more ancient than the building of the *Circus Flaminius* in which it was celebrated from B.C. 220. But, as there is no mention of *ludi plebeiī* in Livy's first decade, it is hazardous to date the games earlier than B.C. 293; they must date between B.C. 293 and 220. Like the *ludi Romani* the festival included an *epulum Iouis* (November 13th) and an *equorum probatio*. Originally *circenses*, the games early became scenic. The *Stichus* of Plautus was produced at them, B.C. 200. In the *Fasti Philocali* four days only are assigned to the games.

(3) *Ludi Cereales* or *Ceriales*, April 12th—19th, *i.e.* eight days. Like the *ludi plebeiī* a festival of the lower orders, for Ceres was the goddess who presided over the *plebs*. They were under the direction of the plebeian aediles, until Iulius Caesar created *aediles Cereales* B.C. 46. There was only one day for the Circus.



(4) *Ludi Apollinares*, July 6th—13th, *i.e.* eight days. The games were instituted in accordance with the advice of the *Carmina Marciana*, when the Romans were deliberating how to drive out Hannibal after the defeat of Cannae, B.C. 212. The directions of the *Carmina Marciana*, confirmed by the Sibylline Books, are given in Livy, xxv 12. In B.C. 208, when there was a dangerous epidemic in Rome and the surrounding districts, the *praetor urbanus*, P. Licinius Varus, proposed that these *ludi in perpetuum in statum diem uouerentur*. Livy adds that the fixed day was the third day before the Nones of July, which is a slip for the third day before the Ides of July. Originally held on July 13th, the *ludi Apollinares* extended to eight days, and, in the Calendar of Philocalus, to nine days, July 5th—13th. One day only was devoted to the Circus and the games were pre-eminently scenic. The management always belonged to the *praetor urbanus*.

(5) *Ludi Megalenses*, April 4th—10th, seven days. This festival dates from B.C. 204. A Sibylline oracle had announced that the presence of Cÿbèle, the *Magna Mater Idaea*, would alone drive the enemy out of Italy, and the sacred stone representing the deity was brought to Rome from Pessinus in Phrygia. These games also were pre-eminently scenic and had only one Circus day.

(6) *Ludi Florales*, April 28th—May 3rd, six days. Essentially scenic. Originally instituted on the command of an oracle in the Sibylline Books, B.C. 238, to obtain from the goddess Flora the protection of the blossoms; made annual B.C. 173. There was a *uenatio* on the last day but no races.

(7) *Ludi Victoriae Sullanae*, October 26th—November 1st, seven days. Instituted by Sulla, B.C. 82, to commemorate his victory over Pontius Telesinus at the Colline Gate. They extended over seven days in the time of Augustus, but had disappeared in the 4th century A.D.

(8) *Ludi Victoriae Caesaris*, July 20th—30th, 11 days, founded by Caesar, B.C. 46, when he dedicated his temple to *Venus Genetrix*. Hence they are known also as *ludi Veneris Genetricis*. There were *munera gladiatorum* and *uenationes*. They were organised by the consuls from B.C. 34, were apparently transferred from September 24th or 25th to July 20th—30th; but disappeared before the 4th century.

Thus the *ludi sollemnes* occupied altogether 76 days, of which 17 days were devoted to *ludi circenses*, 55 to *ludi scaenici*, two to the *equorum probationes* of the *ludi Romani* and the *ludi plebei*, and two to the *epula sacra* of the same festivals.

787. But the duration of the games was often prolonged beyond the normal limits. The religious character of the celebrations was never forgotten. If there was the smallest omission, the slightest deviation or mishap, the proceedings had to be recommenced from the beginning. Hence, the games, which must be *rite facti*, were often prolonged by *instauratio*. Cicero (*de harusp.* 22) gives a conspectus of the mischances which made this necessary:—*si ludius constitit, aut tibicen*

Instauratio.

*repente conticuit, aut puer...si tensam non tenuit, si lorum omisit, aut si aedilis uerbo aut simpuniu aberrauit.* The games could even be annulled by some unexpiated defilement which had previously affected the spot where they were held (Liv. vii 2). Hence we hear of *ludi in unum diem instaurati, per biduum or triduum instaurati*, or even *toti instaurati*. And, as the second attempt was not always ritually perfect, more than one *instauratio* was sometimes required.

788. If the duration of the games increased rapidly, the cost mounted up still more quickly. At first, the State paid to the magistrates responsible for the games the sums needed by them.

Expenses and  
management.

This money was known as *lucar*, perhaps because it was drawn from the revenues of the sacred groves (*luci*) near Rome. Up to B.C. 200 the Senate voted in each case a sum fixed beforehand. Thus 200,000 sesterces had been voted for the *ludi Romani*, when they became annual after the victory of Lake Regillus, and this sum remained unchanged down to the Punic Wars. But, at the close of the third century B.C., the expenses of the games had so increased that the State-vote in 217 was 330,000 sesterces (Liv. xxii 10) and in B.C. 54 it reached 760,000 sesterces (Liv. xxv 12). In the same year, the grant for the *ludi Apollinares* was 380,000, for the *ludi plebei* 600,000. But not only was there this enormous growth in the sums contributed by the State. From B.C. 200 the Senate began to decree games without fixing in advance the sum to be allowed (*pecunia incerta*). This innovation led to grave abuses. Magistrates, especially the aediles, anxious to make the games brilliant, added to the State-contribution from other sources. Despite a *senatus consultum* passed to stop this in 182, and the resolution of the Senate to enforce its decree against Q. Fulvius, who wished to expend on the games which he vowed to Jupiter money amassed for the purpose in Spain, the expenditure of ambitious men increased, and with a light heart they contracted enormous debts, sure that when they obtained provinces they would be able not only to recoup themselves for their outlay but to acquire money enough to give still more splendid shows on their return. In some cases they applied to their friends for assistance or even raised public subscriptions.

789. Originally all citizens had the right of being present at the games. Slaves and foreigners (save public guests) alone were excepted. Places of honour were reserved for magistrates and priests, and this privilege was gradually extended to senators and knights. In theory, admission to all spectacles was free, but there were *ludi priuati* at which payment was made for some places at least.

790. The performers were in general all professionals. Young Romans appeared only in the *ludus Troiac*, the *Pyrrhica* and the *ludi Seuirales* (see *Equites*). Under the early Republic rich citizens had run their chariots in the Circus. But the practice soon ceased, and, until after the establishment of the Empire, it was regarded as a degradation for a citizen to take part in a *ludus scaenicus* or *circensis*.

791. Under the Empire, the number and duration of the *ludi* increased, so that the 76 days of the late Republic rose to 175 days in the *Fasti Philocali*, though the *ludi Romani* and the *ludi plebei* were in the 4th century assigned only four days respectively. Six of the eight *ludi statui* were retained, viz. *Romani*, *plebei*, *Apollinares*, *Megalenses*, *Ceriales*, *Florales*; only the *ludi Victoriae Sullanae* and the *ludi Victoriae Caesaris* had disappeared. On the other hand, many new games were instituted. Under Augustus were added (1) *ludi Martiales*, founded in honour of Mars (when the temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated B.C. 2), and celebrated on May 12th; (2) *ludi Augustales*, first given in B.C. 19, to celebrate the return of Augustus from the East; afterwards annual, October 3rd—12th; (3) *ludi natalicii*, in honour of the birthday of Augustus, September 23rd, made permanent B.C. 8; (4) *Actia* at Rome in imitation of the *Actia* of Nicopolis, celebrated every four years, but at Rome they did not survive the founder. After the time of Augustus fresh games were established in honour of various deities, including Urbs Roma; in honour of the birth of the emperor (*natalicii*) and of his accession (*ludi natalis imperii*); and, when an emperor was deified, his *ludi natalicii* were retained, so that there were nineteen such in A.D. 354. Further games were added to commemorate victories, *ludi Parthici*, *Gotici*, *Persici*, *Sarmatici*, etc.; and the *ludi saeculares* were celebrated on nine occasions, viz. B.C. 249, B.C. 146, B.C. 17 by Augustus, A.D. 47 by Claudius, 88 by Domitian, 147 or 148 by Antoninus Pius, 204 by Septimius Seuerus, 248 by Philippus and 262 (cp. § 148).

Changes and  
additions  
under the  
Empire.

*Ludi priuati* increased not less in number. Besides *ludi funebres*, there were games in honour of happy events in the history of Rome (*ludi honorarii*), such as those given A.D. 93 by L. Arruntius Stella, in celebration of Domitian's Sarmatian victories (Mart. viii 78). There were also semi-public games, especially those given by the emperors to a privileged circle, such as the *ludi Palatini*, celebrated in the imperial Palace, January 17th—22nd, at which Caligula, Nero, Caracalla and other emperors appeared on the stage or in the arena.

792. To return to the distinction between *ludi scaenici* and *ludi circenses*, it will be convenient to summarise their chief characteristics.

*Ludi scaenici.*

On *ludi scaenici* our information is very imperfect. The different steps in the development of the Theatre and the performances will be found under *Theatrum* (§ 800 f). Of the 76 regular days under the later Republic 55 were scenic. From B.C. 240 *ludi Graeci*, at which plays of Liuius, Pacuuius, Ennius and Accius, and comedies of Naevius, Plautus and Terence, were performed, are distinguished from *ludi Latini*, at which *praetextae*, *togatae* and generally original Latin pieces were played. Under the Empire, *ludi Graeci* were given in the *Theatrum Magni* and the *Theatrum Marcelli*; for *ludi Latini* temporary erections were built without seats for the spectators. The *ludi Apollinares*, the *Megalësia*, the *Floralia* were essentially scenic, as were largely *ludi priuati*, such as *ludi funebres*.

793. Present requirements will be satisfied if we distinguish (a) the races in the Circus, (b) the gladiatorial shows, and (c) the *uentiones* in the Amphitheatre, with a separate treatment of (d) *naumachiae*, and (e) *agōnes*, with special reference to music.

794. (a) The *ludi* in the Circus began with a procession from the Capitoline Hill into the Forum, along the Via Sacra, turning into the Vicus Tuscus and entering the Forum Boarium through the Velabrum. On reaching the Circus, the procession passed round the *spina*, stopping to sacrifice and to salute the emperor. At the head of the procession was the consul, or other presiding magistrate, carried in a *bīga* (or *quadriga*), dressed in the *toga picta* and the *pallium*. This is clearly a survival of the time when *ludi circenses* formed part of a triumph. After the parade round the arena, the president took his seat in his box (*puluinar*) and gave the signal for the start with his *mappa* (p. 560). The games consisted mainly of chariot-races. The chariots were drawn by two, three or four horses (*bigae*, *trigae*, *quadrigae*). In early times *bigae* and *quadrigae* were regular, but under the Empire a larger number of horses was sometimes preferred, as affording more scope for skill in driving. The drivers (*aurigae*, or *agitatores*) were slaves or men of very low class. But, under the Empire, successful *aurigae* were honoured and fêted. The victor received a sum of money; if a slave, sometimes his freedom. But their chief gains came from the rich patrons who backed them. Martial (x 74, 5) says that the famous Scorpis 'received 15 heavy purses of gold in one hour'. There was betting (*sponsio*) on the races, and large sums changed hands (see Iuv. xi 202, with Prof. Mayor's note). Originally, four chariots ran in each heat (*missio*), one for each of the four colours, red, white, blue, green, and only a few races were run in the day. But the number of chariots and races was increased by Domitian, and, finally, racing lasted nearly all day. If there was only one day of *circenses*, it was on the last day of the festival. In the *ludi Romani* there were five such days, in the *ludi plebei* three. Under the Empire, *factiones* or companies were formed which provided horses, chariots, drivers and all that was necessary for the games. The giver of the entertainment (*ēditor spectaculorum*) provided the money; the *factiones* found everything requisite. The *factiones* were distinguished by their colours (*factio russata*, *albata*, *uēnēta*, *prāsina*): Domitian added two new colours, purple (*purpurea*) and gold (*aurata*). The *factiones* were carefully organised under a *dominus factionis*, who managed a whole army of subordinates. The rivalry between the colours led not only to heavy betting, but to riot and bloodshed.

795. (b) Under the Republic, gladiators fought in the Forum Boarium (B.C. 264), and the Forum Romanum. But, when Amphitheatres were built, first of wood (B.C. 30), then of stone (B.C. 29), the gladiators usually fought there, though exhibitions were still occasionally given in the Forum, the Circus, the Septa. The gladiators were prisoners of war, or condemned criminals, but their ranks

Gladiatorial  
displays.



were recruited by pressed men, by slaves purchased for the purpose, or by volunteers who sold themselves to the contractors for food and wages as gladiators. No *civis* was supposed to appear; still men of rank, senators and knights, sometimes volunteered, and the emperor Commodus called himself *primus pālus secutorum*. Bands of gladiators (*familiae gladiatorum*) were maintained by rich men, or by speculators, who hired out their services. They were trained in regular schools (*ludī*), of which there are known to have been four at Rome, two at Capua; they were kept in barracks, like that at Pompeii where their *cellae* are in two storeys, and carefully dieted on strengthening food (*sāgīna*). After a preliminary parade, like the *pompa* in the Circus, their weapons were shown to the giver of the entertainment (*editor*) for his approval. There followed a sham fight with blunt weapons (*arma lusoria*), sometimes to music. The signal for the real combat was given by trumpet (*tuba*). The rule was that gladiators armed alike never fought with one another. The fight was man against man, and party against party. If the combatants showed cowardice or lack of zeal, they were spurred on by whips and hot irons. Bearers with biers stood ready to remove the fallen through the *porta Libitīnensis* to the *spoliarium*. When a man was wounded and at the mercy of his adversary, the *editor* decided his fate. This decision was often left to the spectators. The wounded man lifted a finger to plead for release (*missio*): the spectators showed favour by waving their handkerchiefs, condemned by turning down their thumbs (*pollice verso*). The part played by gladiators in the riots and party-fights of Rome led the emperors to control jealously this dangerous element.

796. (c) *Venationes* (of lions and panthers) are first mentioned in the games of M. Fulvius Nobilior, B.C. 186. The importation of wild beasts had been forbidden in the time of Cato the Elder.

Venationes.

But the veto was withdrawn on the proposal of Gnaeus Aufidius, and animal hunts became a most popular form of amusement. Sulla, when praetor in B.C. 93, exhibited 100 lions; the first elephants had been exhibited a few years earlier in 99; elephants fought against bulls in the year of the Luculli, B.C. 79. But Scaurus, when he was curule aedile in B.C. 58, surpassed all previous displays. He introduced a hippopotamus and five crocodiles in a specially constructed water-course. Pompey, at the dedication of the temple of Venus Victrix in B.C. 55, exhibited an enormous number of animals, e.g. 600 lions and 20 elephants, which fought against Gaetulians armed with darts. Julius Caesar, B.C. 45, gave a *venatio* lasting five days, when giraffes were introduced for the first time, and bull-fights were another novelty. In the reign of Augustus, it is stated that 3500 elephants were killed in the Circus. At the opening of the Amphitheatre of Titus, 5000 wild beasts and 4000 tame beasts are said to have been slain. At the celebration of Trajan's victory over the Dacians, 11,000 animals were slaughtered. The men who took part in these combats (*uenatores, bestiarii*) were partly prisoners of war and condemned criminals, partly hired men. They were kept and trained, like the gladiators, in

schools. The imperial *ludus matutinus* was a school of *uenatores*. The name indicates that the *uenationes* took place in the morning, before the gladiatorial combats. Hence the *uenatio* itself is called *ludus matutinus*. The *uenationes* comprised (1) fights between different kinds of wild beasts; (2) combats between the *bestiarii*, trained and armed, and wild beasts; (3) the tearing to pieces of condemned criminals by wild beasts; (4) the exhibition of tame creatures. Under the emperors, numbers of rare and costly animals were brought to Rome at great expense from all parts of the Empire. *Venationes* on a huge scale continued under the later Empire; but they gradually became less bloody, as the *bestiarii* were better armed and were given better chances of escape. These exhibitions originally formed part of the games in the Circus. Even after the building of amphitheatres, *uenationes* still occasionally took place in the Circus. But the more savage animals were pitted against the *bestiarii* in the amphitheatre only. The 'dummies' thrown into the arena for the purpose of infuriating the animals were known as *pilae*.

797. (d) The term *naumachia* (ναυμαχία) was applied by the Romans (1) to the spectacle of a naval battle, (2) by transference, to an artificial basin in which such a spectacle was exhibited. *Naumachiae*. The amphitheatre was sometimes used for the purpose, being flooded with water sufficient to float the ships (Calpurnius, *Ecl.* vii, Dio Cass. lxxvi 25). But, more usually, *naumachiae* were given in basins specially constructed, where the artificial lake was enclosed in stone and surrounded by stone seats like an amphitheatre. The first great *naumachia* was shown by Julius Caesar, B.C. 46, in a basin dug in the district Codeta Minor, probably in the Campus Martius (Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, iii 536). 'A great number of men fought dressed as Tyrians and Egyptians' (Suet. *Iul.* 39). Augustus gave a *naumachia*, B.C. 2, when he dedicated the temple of Mars Ultor. A basin 1800 feet by 1200 feet was dug *trans Tiberim in quo loco nunc est nemus Caesarum* (*Monum. Ancy.*; Suet. *Aug.* 43). Traces of this *naumachia* have been found in the *Horti Caesaris* on the further side of the river. This basin continued in use and was afterwards known as the *uetus naumachia*. On this occasion, B.C. 2, about three thousand men exclusive of rowers were engaged; they represented Athenians and Persians. A famous *naumachia* was exhibited by Claudius, A.D. 52, on Lacus Fucinus (*Celano*) before the great work of draining the lake into the Liris was completed. Suetonius (*Claud.* 21) says that two fleets, Sicilian and Rhodian, each of 12 triremes, fought; Dio Cassius (lx 33, 3), that there were 50 ships in each fleet, a statement which can be reconciled with Suetonius only by supposing that the fleets were made up to 50 by smaller vessels which could be brought to the spot and removed again. In the fight 19,000 men were engaged, and strict precautions were taken to prevent escape (*Tac. Ann.* xii 56). *Naumachiae* of Nero are mentioned as taking place, sometimes in the amphitheatre, sometimes on the *stagna Neronis*, the great basin in Nero's Golden House. On one occasion at least, sea-water was used and

sea-monsters were swimming in the water (Suet. *Ner.* 12; Dio Cass. lxi 9, lxii 15). Titus had a naval battle on the *uetus naumachia* of Augustus (Suet. *Tit.* 7). Domitian built a new *naumachia* below the Vatican, but pulled it to pieces and used the stone to replace the burnt wooden seats of the Circus Maximus (Suet. *Dom.* 5, Dio Cass. lxxviii 8). It may be presumed that *naumachiae* were given in provincial towns, as arrangements for flooding the amphitheatre can be traced, *e.g.* at Capua and at Nîmes. The combatants in these *naumachiae*, known as *naumachiarii* (Suet. *Claud.* 21), were either prisoners or condemned criminals. They fought until one party was killed off, unless they were spared by the clemency of the emperor. The ships were divided into two fleets, the crews of which were dressed to represent the combatants in historical sea-fights, Athenians and Persians, Tyrians and Egyptians, Rhodians and Sicilians, etc. The sacrifice of human life was as appalling as the cost of constructing the basins and the ships was enormous. No extravagance was spared. The show of Titus was *apparatissimum largissimumque*. The basin was planked over; on the first day were gladiators and a *uenatio* of 5000 wild beasts of every kind; on the second, chariot-races; on the third, a *naumachia* of 3000 Athenians and Syracusans. Martial (*Spect.* 24) specially praises the *naumachia* of Domitian, when the combatants represented Corinthians and Corcyraeans (Dio Cass. lxi 25).

798. (e) Contests in the Greek style (*ἀγῶνες*) were introduced at Rome by M. Fulvius Nobilior, B.C. 186, the occasion on which the first recorded *uenatio* took place (Liv. xxxix 22). Musical Agones. contests in the Greek fashion were united with athletic contests at the triumph of L. Anicius, B.C. 167. These contests for some time took place only at intervals, but had become fairly common by the end of the Republic. Under Augustus athletic and musical contests formed part of the quadrennial games *pro salute Caesaris*. But Nero (Tac. *Ann.* xiv 20) first instituted a regular quinquennial festival (*agon Neroneus, Neronia*) consisting of chariot-races, athletic and musical contests. Abandoned after the death of the founder, this institution was revived by Gordian III, A.D. 243, as *Agon Mineruae*. The most famous *ἀγών* was the quadrennial *Agon Capitolinus* founded A.D. 86 by Domitian, who built an *Odeum* in the Campus Martius for the musical contests and a *stadium* for the athletic events. There were contests in Greek and Latin oratory, Greek and Latin poetry, and in music proper; the victors were crowned with a garland of oak-leaves. Still later *agones* are mentioned, such as the *agon* instituted A.D. 248 to celebrate the thousandth anniversary of the founding of Rome, and the *agon Solis* founded by Aurelian A.D. 274. Taking part in these *agones* did not entail the *infamia* which attached to the ordinary *ludi*.

799. The main interest of these *agones* is that they were a public recognition of Music at Rome. Music plays a singularly small part in Roman life. In early times, the *gesta maiorum* Music. were chanted at table to the sound of the *tibia* (Cic. *Tusc.* iv 3). The *tibia*

with trumpets (*lituus, tuba, cornu*) was the chief instrument, and, although the name *tibia* has been supposed to show a Phrygian origin, the ancient *collegium tibicinum* may attest the existence of a native flute. The *tibia* in various forms was the only instrument used to accompany *cantica* on the stage. See *Theatrum* (§ 807).

Subsequent developments of music at Rome were due to Greek influence. But devotion to music was regarded with suspicion, foreign instruments were actually proscribed for a time, and only under the Empire were singing and playing recognised as accomplishments in polite society. Under the Empire, music became prominent in certain cults, mainly cults of an oriental origin, and the mythological ballet (*pantomimus*) owed something to florid music. In the theatre orchestral concerts were given with huge choirs; there were recitations and instrumental solos on stringed and wind instruments. But these developments were artificial and un-Roman.

In Roman private life, music found a place at the dinner-table only. Even the most modest dinner seldom dispensed with music (Pliny *Ep.* i 15). The banquets of the rich were overdone with music. Great men kept troupes of slave-musicians (*pueri symphoniāci*) who accompanied them to their various estates. The Spanish dancing-girls (*Gāditanæ*) with their castagnettes, and the Syrian or Egyptian *ambubaiaæ*, are familiar from the literature of the day. At the *cena Trimalchionis*, Petronius represents even the eating and the waiting as done to music.

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the *ludi* in Roman life. The Roman populace was only too eager to spend day after day—sometimes even whole nights (Suet. *Domit.* 4)—in Circus, Theatre or Amphitheatre. *Panem et circenses* not unfairly sums up their chief desires. This passion may be accounted for, partly by love of the spectacles themselves, especially the fierce excitements of the amphitheatre, partly by the gifts in kind and money, which were lavished upon the audience (Suet. *Calig.* 18, *Ner.* 11, *Domit.* 4, *Stat. Silv.* i 6), perhaps also because the games afforded the best opportunity for showing favour or dislike to their rulers and making their desires effectively known.

Christianity protested against the games, partly on account of their idolatrous origin; still more because they roused passions savage and obscene (Tert. *de Spect.* 5, 13, 14, 17, 19). Under Christian influence Constantine the Great abolished the *damnatio ad ludum*, A.D. 326; the gladiatorial combats disappeared in the next century; the Circus alone continued to flourish. If the *ludi* were not less important than the Greek *ἀγῶνες*, they represent a much more brutal, degrading and immoral side of life.

L. Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte*; Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, III; G. Wissowa in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch* v 4; I. Toutain in Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*.

On the subject of Music reference may be made to Chappell's *History of Music*, 1873 ff.; F. A. Gevaert's *Histoire et Théorie de la Musique de l'Antiquité*, 1873—1881, and H. Gleditsch in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, II 3.



## VI. 16. THE ROMAN THEATRE.

800. THE first performance on the stage at Rome was given in B.C. 364, when a pestilence was raging and the Romans hoped to appease the gods by a novel celebration in their honour. The performers (*ludiones*) were brought from Etruria; the performance was a mimic dance without words but with a flute accompaniment (Liv. vii 2). No regular play was performed till B.C. 240, when Livius Andronicus, a Greek from Tarentum who translated both tragedies and comedies from his native tongue, brought out the first play after a Greek original. The next dramatist was the Campanian Gnaeus Naevius, who exhibited plays B.C. 225 (Gellius xvii 21, 44).

Early  
temporary  
theatres.

So far there was no thought of building a theatre. A temporary wooden platform (*pulpitum*) was erected for the actors, the *auditorium* was enclosed with a barrier of wood, perhaps a *tribūna* was raised for persons of importance, and the spectators ranged themselves as best they could. No seats were provided for them. The *ludi Romani* may perhaps be regarded as 'scenic' from 'the erection of the scaffolding of boards in the Circus,' B.C. 364. But, when the *ludi plebei* and the *ludi Apollinares* had become scenic at the close of the 3rd cent. B.C., and the *Megalesia* were regularly celebrated from B.C. 194, it still continued to be the practice to erect a temporary platform in front of the temple of the god in whose honour the festival was held, or perhaps more often in the Circus (Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, iii 509). It was on such temporary wooden stages that the plays of Plautus and Terence were produced. Even the reservation of places for the Senate in B.C. 194 occasioned dissatisfaction (Liv. xxxiv 54), though seats were not provided for them, but brought by their slaves. For another 140 years no theatre at Rome was more than a temporary wooden building. Throughout the Republic, a strong prejudice existed against the building of a permanent theatre, lest it should lead to luxurious Greek habits (Tac. *Ann.* xiv 21). A contract for building a theatre had, indeed, been given by the censors of B.C. 155, but the ex-consul, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, persuaded the Senate to order the demolition of the work '*tāquam inutile et nociturum publicis moribus.*' The Senate forbade the erection of such buildings and prohibited the renting of seats at scenic performances; *populusque aliquamdiu stans ludos spectavit* (Liv. *Epit.* xlviii). But, ten years later, L. Mummius, the destroyer of Corinth, erected wooden seats for the spectators at the plays which were given at his triumph.

Meanwhile, there were theatres in provincial towns, some of which were not Greek buildings, merely taken over by the Romans. Tusculum, Faesulae and Pompeii are cases in point. In Rome itself, the spirit of the law had been disregarded in the wooden theatre built by M. Aemilius

Scaurus, when he was aedile, B.C. 58. This building is described by Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* xxxvi §§ 5, 113—115) as most costly and magnificent, and as containing seats for 80,000 spectators. In B.C. 50 C. Curio built a




Fig. 48. Plan of the Theatre of Pompey. From the *Pianta Capitolina*.

temporary structure still more marvellous. There were two wooden theatres in which dramatic performances were given. The two theatres were made to swing round on pivots so as to meet and form an amphitheatre for gladiatorial displays (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* xxxvi §§ 116—120).

**801.** The first stone theatre was the Theatre of Pompey (*Theatrum Magni*) opened B.C. 55 but not completed till 52 (Dio Cass. xxxix 38; Plut. *Pomp.* 52). Pompey met the prejudice against a permanent stone theatre by constructing in it a temple to Venus Victrix in such a way that the stone seats and steps gave access to the temple, and so the fact that they were not of wood might be forgiven. This building, which Vitruvius (iii 3) calls *theatrum lapideum*, 'the stone theatre' *par excellence*, provided accommodation for 40,000 people. It is said to have resembled the Greek theatre at Mytilene. It was begun shortly after Pompey's visit to Mytilene, but it cannot have been a copy of the theatre there, as the *cavea* is exactly a semicircle *more Romano* (Fig. 48), whereas, in Greek theatres, the *cavea* was always more than half a circle. There are considerable remains of Pompey's Theatre, but unfortunately they are almost entirely concealed by modern houses. (See

Permanent  
theatres.

Middleton's *Remains of Ancient Rome*, 1892, ii 62, 66—68.) Outside the theatre proper, at the back of the *scaena*, there was a fine building supported by parallel rows of columns, which formed a *Porticus*, with an open space in the centre planted with trees and adorned with fountains and statues. This was the *Porticus Pompeii* or *Ambulatio Magni* (Catullus, lv 6), which was also known as the *Hecatostylon*, 'the Hall of the Hundred Pillars' (Mart. ii 14, 9, iii 19). The *Porticus Pompeii* adjoined the *Curia Pompeii*, a hall with one side covered and fitted with tiers of seats. This *Curia* was used for meetings of the Senate, and here Caesar was murdered at the foot of the great statue of Pompey which stood in the centre (Cic. *de Divin.* ii 9, 23; Plut. *Caes.* 66). Pompey's Theatre suffered frequently from fire. It was restored by Augustus at great cost (*Monum. Ancy.*): the *scaena* was rebuilt by Tiberius after another fire, the remainder of the building being restored by Caligula. It was again burnt in the great fire of A.D. 80 and restored by Titus (Tac. *Ann.* iii 72 and vi 45; Suet. *Calig.* 21). But after several later fires and restorations the theatre was in use as late as the 6th cent. A.D.

802. The *Theatrum Marcelli* was begun by Julius Caesar and completed B.C. 13 by Augustus, who dedicated it in the name of his nephew Marcellus, the son of Octavia (*Monum. Ancy.*; Suet. *Aug.* 29). The Theatre of Marcellus on the borders of the *Forum Olitorium*, just outside the Servian wall, occupied the site of an earlier theatre built by Aemilius Lepidus but probably pulled down, with the temple of Pietas, by Caesar, to make room for his new building. The Theatre of Marcellus suffered from a fire which burnt the adjoining *Porticus Octaviae*, and was restored by Vespasian (Suet. *Vesp.* 19). In the Catalogue of the Regions of Rome under Regio IX is '*Theatrum Marcelli: capit loca XXX mil.*' From the existing remains, Prof. Middleton (*l.c.* ii 72) doubts whether the theatre could have seated 30,000 spectators.

803. The *Theatrum (Cornelii) Balbi* was built B.C. 13 in the same quarter as the *Theatrum Marcelli*, a little to the N.W. of the latter, close to the river bank. It is mentioned by Suetonius (*Aug.* 29) as one of many buildings erected at this time in Rome by private persons under the influence and encouragement of Augustus, who was most anxious to beautify Rome. This theatre was a building of great splendour; at the back of the *scaena* was a *Crypto-Porticus* or covered hall. According to the Catalogue of the Regions, the *Theatrum Balbi* seated more than 30,000 spectators. The colossal statues of Castor and Pollux leading their horses, now at the top of the Capitoline steps, were found in this theatre.

Rome possessed no stone theatre besides these three. But, even in the imperial era, temporary theatres were still erected for great occasions. See the references given in Marquardt's *Staatsverwaltung*, iii 531<sup>2</sup>. A full description of the theatres of Pompey, Marcellus and Balbus will be found in Middleton's *Remains of Ancient Rome*, 1892, ii 61—74. The




Fig. 49. View of the Large Theatre, Pompeii. From a photograph by Sommer, Naples.



two theatres at Pompeii—the Large Theatre (originally Greek, but rebuilt in Roman times), 2nd cent. B.C., and the Small Theatre (Roman), about B.C. 80—are described in Mau's *Pompeii* (trans. Kelsey), pp. 135–150. For the general view of the Large Theatre see Fig. 49; for the ground-plan Fig. 50.




Fig. 50. Plan of the Large Theatre, Pompeii.  
From Mau's *Pompeii*.

- |                   |                            |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Dressing room. | 5. Media cauca.            |
| 2. Stage.         | 6. Summa cauca.            |
| 3. Orchestra.     | 7. Tribunalia.             |
| 4. Ima cauca.     | 8. Tank for saffron water. |

804. The Roman theatre is the Greek theatre adopted with modifications. The two most important differences are (1) that the *orchestra* is not, as in the Greek theatre, a circle or the greater part of a circle, but only a semicircle. The Roman theatre was a semicircular building: hence an *amphitheatrum*, or 'double theatre', was a circular or oval building; (2) that, whereas in the Greek theatre the *auditorium* and the stage-buildings were not united, as the *πάροδοι* or side-entrances into the *δρῦστρον* intervened between them, in the Roman theatre the side-walls of the *scaena* were continued until they met the side-walls of the *auditorium*. Thus, the whole theatre formed one connected building. These two main differences entailed further deviations. (3) As there were no longer any *πάροδοι* to give access to the *orchestra*, some other means of entrance had to be provided. This was accomplished by the use of the arch and by cutting off the last seats in the lowest rows right and left of the stage. By these means space and height were made for vaulted passages running under the outer part of the *auditorium* into the *orchestra*. (4) As the whole theatre was now a compact building, there was more scope for and more need of decoration. The decoration of the Greek *proscenium* had been simple: the Romans lavished architectural or sculptural adornment upon their *proscenium*. Similarly, outside the

The arrangements of the Roman theatre.

The arrange-  
ments of the  
Roman  
theatre.

building, there was far more decoration. This was the more necessary because the Romans did not, like the Greeks, avail themselves of a natural slope for a theatre, but usually built on level ground. Hence the *auditorium* (*theatrum* in the narrower sense) was raised on massive substructures, the walls of which were connected by arches. Staircases ascended below the *auditorium* to the different rows of seats, and corridors, opening on to these staircases, ran along the inner side of the wall enclosing the *auditorium*. Externally, this semicircular wall was decorated with columns with arcades between them, rising in three, or more, successive storeys. In the Greek theatre, the interior was everything: in the Roman theatre, the exterior also was elaborated and adorned.

The Roman theatre had a semicircular *auditorium* (*theatrum*, *cauea*, *spectacula*) the diameter of which was parallel to the back-wall of the stage (*frons scaenae*). In front of the stage in the centre was a semicircle, the *orchestra*, reserved for the Senate; behind this *orchestra* rose in increasing semicircles the tiers of seats (*gradus*, *subsellia*) for the ordinary public. These tiers of seats were often divided into two or more storeys by broad semicircular passages (*praecinctiones*), but this was not essential. If there were two *praecinctiones*, the rows of seats between the *orchestra* and the lowest *praecinctio* were known as *ima cauea*, the rows between the lower and the upper *praecinctio* as *media cauea*, the rows between the upper *praecinctio* and the outer wall as *summa cauea*. From the *orchestra* to the outer circumference of the semicircle radiating staircases divided the *auditorium* into 'blocks' of seats (*cūnēi*). The upper storey of the *cauea* was finished by a semicircular roofed colonnade.

Immediately in front of the *scaena* was a stage (*pulpitum proscaenii*) on which *all* the actors appeared. Hence it was longer and broader than the Greek stage (Vitruvius v 6—8). A staircase led to it from the *orchestra*. The back of the stage (*frons scaenae*) represented a wall of wood, which was first decorated by C. Claudius Pulcher, when he was aedile, B.C. 99. From this time extravagant decoration became common. Scaurus, in his temporary theatre in B.C. 58, had a background of three storeys adorned with 360 columns and 3000 bronze statues. In the permanent theatres the background, which rose to the same height as the outer wall enclosing the *cauea*, had, as a rule, three storeys, three (sometimes five) doors, and was elaborately decorated. It was enclosed at each end by side-wings (*uersurae procurrentes*), each of which gave access to the stage. Behind the *scaena*, internally there was a dressing-room (*postscænium*), externally a colonnade (*porticus*), in which the audience could take refuge from a sudden shower (Vitruv. v 9). Over the whole *auditorium* could be spread awnings (*vela*), supported on masts (*māli*) let into stone sockets in the outer wall. These awnings, the introduction of which is ascribed to Q. Catulus B.C. 78, were of bright colours, yellow, red, dark-blue (Lucr. iv 75 ff.). The theatre was first cooled with water by Pompey; later, there were sprays (*sparsiones*), and saffron (*crocus*) was sprinkled to cool

and perfume the house (Lucr. ii 416; Ovid, *ars am.* i 103; Lucan, ix 806).

805. From B.C. 194 the front places were reserved for senators. When the stone theatres after the Greek style were built, the *orchestra* was reserved for the Senate, and the first 14 rows (*subsellia*) behind them were definitely set apart for the *equites* by the *Lex Roscia Othonis*, B.C. 67. The places of the people generally were probably assigned to them according to their tribes. The *Lex Roscia* was modified by a *Lex Iulia Theatralis* under Augustus, who separated the different orders. From this time probably dates the assignment of seats in the *orchestra* to officials and priests, to *collegia* and corporations, and the placing of women in the upper part of the *cauea*. Separate places were assigned to *praetextati* (i.e. boys who had not yet assumed the *toga virilis*) with their *paedagogi*, to soldiers and to married plebeians. The most distinguished places were in the two *tribunalia* over the entrances to the *orchestra* and immediately in front of the stage, right and left. One *tribunal*, that on the right of the stage, was reserved for the emperor or the giver of the entertainment, that on the left for the Vestal virgins, with whom the empress sat (Vitruv. v 6; Tac. *Ann.* iv 16; Suet. *Aug.* 44, *Jos. Ant.* xix. 13).

Assignment  
of seats.

The *cunei* were numbered and named: the tickets (*tesserae*) were marked so as to indicate the place of the seats. *Tesserae* exist with a statue on one side, a number on the other; but these 'are now identified as *tesserae lusoriae* used as draughts in the *ludus duodecim scriptorum*' (§ 1112 (2)). There were also subordinate officials of the *curatores ludorum*, known as *dissignatores*, charged with the duty of seeing that people took their proper places. Two freedmen, Leitus and Oceanus, who held this post under Domitian, are referred to by Martial (iii 95, v 8, 23 and 27, vi 9, xiv 25) as a terror to persons who tried to take better places than those to which they were entitled.

806. The magistrate, whose duty it was to give the games, hired and paid the actors. Their remuneration (*merces*) gradually rose from a small sum to a considerable amount. Each troupe of actors (*grex*, *caterua*) was under the direction of a manager (*dominus gregis*), generally a freedman, who was also known as *actor*. So *agere fabulas* = 'to produce plays'. The Plautine *actor*, T. Publilius Pellio, and the Terentian, L. Ambilius Turpio, are well known. At first, the manager paid the poet a lump sum: later, the payment to the poet depended on the degree of success attained by the piece.

The actors.

The actors were slaves or freedmen, specially trained. They were looked down upon, and to act was attended by *infamia*, from which the performers of *Atellanae*, so long as they were amateurs, were alone exempt. Nevertheless, clever and popular actors, such as the comedian Roscius and the tragedian Aesôpus, gained both honour and wealth. Under the Empire, men of position, such as knights, were persuaded or forced to appear on

the stage. This improved the position of professional actors. Thus, in the time of Plautus, actors were liable to be flogged (Plaut. *Cist.* 785, *qui deliquit uapulabit, qui non deliquit bibet*). But Augustus limited or removed this liability to castigation (Tac. *Ann.* i 77), and actors held positions of honour in *municipia*, from which they had been expressly excluded, with thieves and butchers, in the *Lex Iulia Municipalis*. Rewards were given to actors (possibly in the time of Plautus, certainly at the date to which the post-Plautine prologues belong), consisting of palms, wreaths of gold or silver leaf, and other presents. In the imperial age, costly robes and money were given. This practice of making presents led to rivalry between the actors, and regular *clagues* were organised (*fautores, theatrales operae*) to applaud an actor, or to shout down opposition and opponents. Riots resulted, in which lives were sometimes lost, and in consequence the actors and their adherents were punished and even banished (Tac. *Ann.* i 77, iv 4, xiii 28; Suet. *Tib.* 37).

807. Information as to the pieces to be played was given to the audience at first by heralds (*praecōnes*), afterwards by play-bills (*programmata*), and, at the beginning of each piece, an announcement (*pronuntiatio tituli*) was made from the stage. The curtain, which concealed the stage from the house, was lowered (*aulaeum prēmītur, subducitur*) at the commencement of the piece, and raised into position again (*aulaeum tollitur*) at the end. Behind the drop-curtain there was sometimes a light inner curtain (*sipārium*), screening only part of the stage, which could be drawn aside. The early plays were divided into scenes, not into acts, and the performance was continuous, save that the short pauses necessary between scenes were filled up in comedy by the flute-music of the *tibicen*, in tragedy by choral-music. The rule that a play should be divided into five acts was probably not recognised before the time of Horace. From Livius Andronicus onwards, a drama consisted of a succession of scenes, which were either dialogue (*diuerbium* or *deuerbium*), or delivered to musical accompaniment (*canticum*), what we should call *recitative*. Hence, in mss of Plautus, scenes are marked DV or C. According to Livy (vii 2) the actor merely followed the *cantica* with appropriate gesture, the words were chanted by a *cantor*.

The music required for a play, including the *overture*, was composed by a musician, whose name is generally given in the *Didascalia*. These musicians appear, like the actors, to have been slaves, no doubt highly and specially trained. Thus Marciapor (slave) of Oppius, composed for Plautus; Flaccus (slave) of Claudius, for Terence. The instrument used was the double flute, of which four kinds may be distinguished, viz. *tibiae pāres*, *tibiae impares*, *tibiae sinistrae*, *tibiae duae dextrae*. When *tibiae pāres* were used, the mood (Dorian, Lydian, Phrygian) did not vary throughout the piece; with *tibiae impares* there was a change of mood. *Tibiae dextrae* were high-pitched, treble, flutes: *tibiae sinistrae* were low-pitched, bass, flutes. *Tibiae Sarranae* are said to be *tibiae sinistrae*.

The performance, dresses and scenery.



The instruments became complex and the music effeminate under the Empire (Hor. *A. P.* 202—215, Quint. i 10, 31).

The parts, female as well as male, were acted by men. Women acted only in *mimi* (and in comedy at a late date). Masks were not introduced until after the time of Terence. Previous to their introduction, the parts played by the actors were denoted by wigs (*gālēri, gālēaria*). Old men wore white wigs and carried a stick, young lovers wore black wigs, slaves red wigs. The introduction of the mask is assigned, in tragedy, to Minucius Prothymus, in comedy, to Cincius Faliscus; but the use of the mask did not become general for some time. Roscius made masks fashionable, and, after him, they were regularly used (except in *mimi*). The distinguishing dress of tragedy was long sweeping robes (*syrmata*) and high buskins (*cōthurni*). In comedy, ordinary dress was worn with the slipper (*soccus*). In Plautus' time there were agents (*chōrāgi*) who let out theatrical costumes (*ornamenta*) on hire (*Pers.* 159, *Trin.* 858). Under the Empire, certainly from the time of Domitian, a *procurator summi choragii* had charge of the costumes, decorations and apparatus required for all plays and shows.

As has been stated above (§ 804), Gaius Claudius Pulcher introduced stage decoration, B.C. 99. Vitruvius (v 8) explains that the regular practice was for the *scaena tragica* to show a royal palace, the *scaena cōmica*, a private house with windows and balcony, or a street; the *scaena satyrica*, a country place. A change of scene was effected either by a *scaena ductilis*, when the scene was moved to the side bringing the next set into view, or a *scaena uersilis*, when a different face was shown by turning the *periacti* (περίακτοι), huge three-sided prisms, each side of which suited a different scene. This last method was an improvement introduced by M. and L. Licinius Lucullus, B.C. 79. The Roman stage made provision for the appearance of actors in the air, for their coming up from below, and for their disappearance by means of *pēgmata*. According to Pollux, such machinery was placed on the left-hand side of the stage.

Marquardt's *Staatsverwaltung*, iii; F. Ritschl's *Parerga Plautina et Terentiana*; Middleton's *Remains of Ancient Rome*, ed. 1892; Jebb in Smith's *Dict. of Antiq.* ed. 3. For Pompeii, Mau's *Pompeii* Bibliography. (trans. Kelsey); for Orange (Arausio), A. Caristie, *Monuments antiques d'Orange*.

## VII. ART.

### VII. 1. ARCHITECTURE.

808. SOME few indications of the architecture of the most primitive stage of Italian civilisation have been supplied by the remains of lake-dwellings in the 'Terramare' villages of the valley of the Po, which belong partly to the Neolithic period but chiefly to the Copper and Bronze ages. Another, perhaps, is to be seen in Rome itself, in the trapezoidal plan retained in some of the most ancient sacred buildings, even when reconstructed in materials of the late Republic or the early Empire. The 'Terramare' villages on both sides of the Apennines, explored by Professor Luigi Pigorini, are laid out on this plan, and it is suggested that the original trapezoidal (that is, four-sided but not rectangular) buildings, of which these late Roman structures are the lineal descendants, belonged to this same 'Terramare' period.

809. Again, hints as to the architecture of the Early Iron Age may be gathered from the hut-shaped cinerary urns found at Villanuova near Bologna, in Rome, and elsewhere<sup>1</sup>. But, of actual architectural remains on Italian soil, the earliest consist of prehistoric walls in Etruria, at Caere, Falerii, Pyrgi, and Saturnia, for example, and in Latium, at Aletrium, Arpinum, Olevano, Signia, and other places. In these three methods of construction are represented: (1) the 'Cyclopean', in which masses of roughly quarried or unquarried rock are piled on each other, the interstices being filled with smaller stones and clay mortar; (2) the 'Polygonal', in which the blocks are accurately cut so as to fit closely one into another, but are not squared or set in regular courses; and (3) the 'Rectangular', in which the blocks are set in regular courses and the joints in the masonry are vertical and horizontal. The gateways piercing these walls are of three varieties. The simplest form has a massive lintel supported by two side-posts, which are set vertically, or slope towards each other so as to make the gateway narrower at the top than at the bottom. In other cases each succeeding course of the wall was made to project beyond the one beneath, so that the opening was gradually narrowed and

The earliest remains; walls of 'Cyclopean', 'Polygonal', or 'Rectangular' construction.

<sup>1</sup> See Fig. 17 and Fig. 18 on p. 218 *supra*.

finally completely bridged ; or, again, a true arch formed of wedge-shaped voussoirs was employed. These features of construction have all been observed on 'Mycenaean' sites in Greece, albeit the employment of the true arch is rare. They are doubtless to be attributed to the same civilisation as the Hellenic examples. In Italy they are commonly ascribed to the Etruscans. Other architectural relics of this civilisation may be recognised in a dome-shaped building found near Quinto Fiorentino (Etruria), and in the lower chamber of the Tullianum, Rome, the roof of which, now truncated, was dome-shaped, and constructed in a manner similar to the 'bee-hive tombs' of 'Mycenaean' sites. Further details as to the structures of this period may be gathered from tombs such as those found at Caere and Tarquinii, which are obviously imitations of dwelling-houses.

810. We have Varro's authority for the statement that, before the building of the temple of Ceres (B.C. 494), 'all things in Roman temples were Etruscan' (Plin. *N. H.* xxxv 154), a remark which is possibly to be applied to the temples themselves and not only to the objects which they contained. But, even assuming this, we cannot positively determine the character of the Roman temple in the first half of the fifth century B.C. Vitruvius, it is true, gives a detailed description of a temple built in Tuscan style, but unfortunately we have not sufficient remains to confirm his account. (See, however, the ground-plans of temples at Falerii etc. in Durm's *Baukunst der Etrusker*, p. 104 f.)<sup>1</sup> Varro, again, may have regarded as Etruscan the buildings of trapezoidal plan to which we have referred, and this type, we have seen, was in some cases preserved even under the Empire (§ 808). On the other hand, the ethnological history of Rome suggests the great probability of a similarity of form between many early buildings in Rome and those of Etruria. The history of Roman house-architecture provides evidence of this similarity, and the existence of identity of form has already been remarked in the case of the Tullianum and the dome-shaped building at Quinto Fiorentino. Moreover, however small the Etruscan element in the Roman population, the early borrowing of the architectural style of the Etruscans can be paralleled by the later appropriation of the distinctive styles of Greece, modified according to the inferior taste of the Roman designer.

Early  
temples.

811. The Roman people, indeed, would seem never to have possessed a developed architectural style which was essentially its own, a deficiency which may, in large part, be attributed to the multiplicity which, history tells us, characterised its racial composition. Though exceedingly practical as planners and, in many respects, able as engineers, the Romans appear as borrowers rather than originators in art; capable of seizing on the possibilities suggested by their neighbours' inventions and of adapting them to their own use, yet incapable of artistic refinement and appreciation ; skilful and powerful, yet

Character-  
istics of  
Roman  
architecture.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Th. Wiegand, *Le temple étrusque d'après Vitruve*, and L. Fenger, *Le temple étrusco-latin de l'Italie centrale*.

frequently guilty of utter tastelessness and wild vulgarity. Even the arch, the employment of which (above ground) one associates most readily with the architecture of Rome, was an invention not peculiarly Roman, being known, not only in Etruria, but also, though only used under ground, in Egypt and Greece from early times. To the Romans, however, belongs the great credit of appreciating its possibilities, and its general employment constitutes one of their chief claims to architectural originality. We may deny them the title of inventors, and even belittle the skill requisite for the construction of the 'Roman' arch; we may recognise that the employment of the semicircular arch does not involve the nice calculations of thrust demanded of the Gothic architect when dealing with the pointed variety; but we must at least admit that, by the extensive employment of the arch, the Romans opened up new possibilities of design, and laid the foundation on which the Gothic architect was afterwards to build.

**812.** More peculiarly Roman was the employment of concrete for the most varied purposes: not only for foundations, and as a backing for walls of stone, but also for vaults and independent walls. Concrete first appears at Rome in the regal period, and, for a long time, it was used with caution and timidity. It seems that, for many generations, the Romans failed to realise the great strength of the material, which they formed of lime and pozzolana (*pulvis Puteolanus*, a volcanic earth existing in extensive beds at Puteoli and also under and round the city of Rome itself), although it actually possesses 'the very greatest excellence in strength, hardness and durability'. It was not until the second century B.C. that concrete was used for independent walls, but thereafter its employment was common both for walls and vaults. The appreciation of its qualities and the recognition of its possibilities may be regarded as responsible for the boldness of design which characterises many of the works of the later Roman architects.

**813.** In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, in the absence, too, of any intrinsic improbability, we may perhaps accept the Vitruvian account of the Tuscan style as a fair description of the type of temple prevalent at Rome in the period preceding that gradual submission to Greek influence, which reached its climax after the conquest of Greece in the middle of the second century B.C. The Tuscan temple, according to Vitruvius (iv 7), should occupy an area the breadth of which is five-sixths of the length. This space is to be filled, as to one-half, by three rectangular *cellae* of equal depth placed side by side, and, as to the other, by a portico (*pronaös*), the columns of which were to be disposed as indicated in the adjoining plan (Fig. 51). The central *cella* is to be broader than the others, which may be replaced by aisles (*alae*) made by the continuation of the row of columns forming each side of the portico in the place of the side-wall existing in the other arrangement. The platform (*stylobāta*) occupied by a temple of

The arch.

Use of concrete.

The Tuscan temple and order.



either type could not well be completely surrounded by steps. Consequently it appears justifiable to assume that the high *podium* or substructure, approached by steps from one side only, which is a common feature of the Roman temple, belongs in origin to the Tuscan style. The 'order' of such a *podium* is described by Vitruvius as comprising plinth, base-moulding,




Fig. 51. Plan of Tuscan Temple, according to Vitruvius.




Fig. 52. Tuscan column found at Pompeii. (Total height c. 10 ft 6 ins.)

dado, cornice, and blocking course, the object of the last being to prevent the bases of the columns from being hidden by the projecting cornice, if the *podium* were high. The Tuscan column, which was evidently intended by Vitruvius (iv 7) to be of stone, was provided with a base (*spira*), consisting of a circular plinth with vertical edge (*plinthus*) on which rested a convex moulding (*törus*). Above this rose a slender unfluted shaft having a slight expansion (*äpöphýgē*, *äpöphýsis*) at its foot and beneath the necking (*hýpöträchèlium*). The capital possessed an *ëchinus*, one sixth of the lower diameter of the column in height, and an *äbäcus* (or *plinthus*) of the same height and of a breadth equal to the lower diameter aforesaid, but the profile of both is undefined (iv 7, 3). The intervals between the columns were wide because the entablature was made of wood, and apparently it was simple in character. There is no mention of the division into architrave and frieze familiar in Greek architecture, but the beams which supported the ceiling of the portico must either have rested on the architrave or, less probably, have been let into it. In the former case, their ends may have been cut off and boarded over, level with the architrave, or they may have been morticed into the principal rafters with the result that the architrave alone would be visible from below, underneath the eaves. The squat appearance which would thus be given to the temple is mentioned

by Vitruvius as characteristic of araeostyle<sup>1</sup> temples (that is, temples with very wide intercolumniations), the entablature of which was necessarily of wood. The remarks which immediately follow suggest that he was thinking of the Tuscan temple. This squatness could to some extent be diminished by the height given to the gable, which, according to some, was greater than in the case of temples built in Greek style. The entablature was protected from the weather by spreading eaves, the ends of the rafters being provided with facings (*antepagmenta*) possibly of terracotta. Stone might be employed for the pediment, probably because in this case the eaves would not provide that adequate protection from the weather, which they supplied at the sides of the building. It appears that the angles of the pediment supported statues of terracotta or of gilded bronze. The columns of the monument of Bibulus bear a general resemblance to the Tuscan column of Vitruvius. (A Tuscan column has been found at Pompeii<sup>2</sup>.)

814. The adoption of the Greek styles of architecture in Rome was, no doubt, a gradual process, but the stages of this process have been almost completely obscured by the frequent rebuilding of the various temples and public edifices during the long period in which the fashion was prevalent. For the Greek styles (and in particular the Corinthian), when once accepted and imitated, retained a permanent and prominent place in Roman architecture, though they were considerably modified, and constantly employed in conjunction with features entirely foreign to them, and, in fact, repugnant to the spirit of Greek architecture. It does not seem possible to assign a certain date to the beginning of the process, which, in view of the employment of Dāmo-philos and Gorgāsos as painters and modellers on the decorations of the temple of Ceres, may have been considerably earlier than the conquest of Magna Graecia and Sicily in the third century B.C., even if we do not regard these artists as contemporary with the consul Spurius Cassius, who dedicated the temple in 494 B.C. in fulfilment of a vow made by the dictator, Aulus Postumius, three years before (Dion. Hal. vi 17 and 94); and even if we neglect the traditions of still earlier intercourse with Greece. In any case, the third and still more the second century B.C. must be considered responsible for the more general adoption of the Greek styles of architecture, which in the succeeding century were in regular employment. We must suppose that they were previously represented by only occasional examples.

815. Doubtless at first, when it was desired to build or re-build after the Greek fashion, architects from Greece, Magna Graecia, or Sicily, would be commissioned, just as, at a later date, the celebrated Apollodōrus was employed by Trajan and Hadrian; but at any rate as early as the first half of the second century B.C., when a Roman architect, Cossutius, was selected by Antiochus Epiphanes to continue the building of the Olympieion at

<sup>1</sup> ἀραιόστυλος. Vitruvius, iii 3, 5 'in araeostylis) ipsarum aedium species sunt barycephalae humiles latae'. <sup>2</sup> Röm. Mittheilungen, 1902, taf. vii (Fig. 52 supra).

Athens, architects of Roman birth had accommodated their designs to the prevailing fashion. If the original introducers of the Hellenic styles were faithful in the reproduction of the types they knew, it is nevertheless certain that their successors were less conservative, and the Graecised buildings which have survived, and belong mostly to the first centuries before and after Christ, exhibit debased, enfeebled and vulgarised forms, in which the shortcomings of Roman artistic taste are all too often apparent.

**816.** Graeco-Roman temples, as we know them, differed very considerably from their models both in plan, proportions, and details. In the first place the temple stood as a rule upon a Temple-plans. high platform (*podium*) approached by steps at one side only, a feature which we have seen reason to believe was Etruscan in origin, and this was sometimes the case even when the temple, like that of Castor in the Roman Forum, was completely surrounded by an ambulatory. The plan of the temple itself generally shows Etruscan influence in one or more respects. Thus, while the *cella* is usually single, the portico is often given a depth unknown in Greece, and the ambulatory, when extant, often does not completely surround the temple, but is stopped by the prolongation of the back-wall of the *cella*; so that *alae* are formed somewhat after the Tuscan fashion (see above, § 813). The temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, though Graecised in other respects, appears to have retained, throughout its many restorations, some of the Etruscan features of its original plan. It had three *cellae* side by side, the central one dedicated to Jupiter, the others to Juno and Minerva, and in addition an *ala* on either flank, while the portico in front occupied approximately one half of the temple-platform. Where no ambulatory exists at the sides of the temple, the side- and back-walls of the *cella* may be ornamented with engaged columns retaining the 'order' and disposition of the columns of the portico. This variety of temple is classed by Vitruvius as *pseudoperipteral*. In many cases, the side-walls of the *cella* were not prolonged beyond the cross-wall containing the door, but we have examples of such projections (*antae*) terminating in pilasters. Sometimes they have columns placed between them, as in the Greek temple *in antis*. The inner end of the *cella* is sometimes occupied by an apse,—a feature of Greek origin, also adopted in the *basilica*. Buttresses may project inwards from each side-wall, or a row of columns may stand in front of it. In either case, the addition is merely ornamental, and is not employed to lessen the span of the roof. In his preference for the high *podium*, and in the formation of his plan, the Roman architect was most probably influenced by the adverse conditions under which he was frequently obliged to build. The confined space available, for example, in the neighbourhood of the Forum (which often precluded attention to orientation) made access from more sides than one impossible, and at the same time suggested the desirability of emphasizing the importance of the façade, both by increasing the depth of the *pronaos* in Tuscan fashion, and by raising the temple more considerably (possibly to avoid the floods). It

appears that, in early days, strict attention was paid to the orientation of temples in Rome as in Greece, but that, when Caesar re-arranged the buildings surrounding the Forum, it was entirely disregarded. It may be noted here that the adoption of the Tuscan or modified Tuscan style of *pronaos* usually involved the use of wood, or of vaulting, for its ceiling; because the space between the front columns and the *antae* was obviously too large to be bridged by a single block of stone. Even where, as in the porch of the Pantheon, extra columns were placed in front of the central *antae*, the necessity for such expedients might still exist for the roofing of the central and side aisles thus formed in the portico.

817. The plan of the huge double temple of *Venus and Roma*, which was begun by Hadrian and completed by Antoninus Pius, conformed more closely than that of other rectangular Roman temples to one of the recognised Greek types. Standing within a colonnade or cloister of about 180 columns, the temple itself, in accordance with the advice of the Greek architect and engineer, Apollodorus of Damascus, was raised upon a high stylobate, and this was accessible from all four sides. On the stylobate the two *cellae* were placed back to back, each being approximately square and fronted by a *pronaos* with four columns between the *antae*; and, as if they composed a single temple, they were surrounded by a continuous colonnade supporting a common roof. Ten columns were displayed at each end of the temple and twenty at each side, and the *antae* were in a line with the third columns of the façades. The building therefore was *decastyle* and *pseudodipteral*. In the interior, however, the *cellae* were thoroughly Roman:




Fig. 53. Plan of the Temple of Venus and Roma. After Canina, *Architettura Antica*, iii, tav. 32. Cp. Durm's *Baukunst*, p. 546, and Jordan-Huelsen's *Topogr.* I iii 20, n. 47.



each ended in an apse, each was surrounded by purely ornamental columns and niches, and had a vaulted ceiling. See Fig. 53 and Fig. 54.




Fig. 54. Section of the Temple of Venus and Roma. After Canina, iii, tav. 33.

818. Circular temples and shrines, which were by no means common during the golden age in Greece, were erected with comparative frequency in Italy. Vitruvius recognised two types, *monopteral* and *peripteral*. In the former there was no *cella*-wall and a single row of columns supported the roof. In the latter a circular *cella* (which sometimes has engaged columns along the inner side of the wall) was surrounded by a single row of columns. Familiar examples are the temple of Mater Mātūta or of Hercules, formerly called 'of Vesta', in the Forum Boarium, and the temple 'of Vesta' at Tibur, both of which belong to the latter class. The Pantheon stands under neither head. Its huge *cella*, 142 feet 6 inches in diameter, has no exterior colonnade, but is approached through a deep rectangular portico bearing some resemblance to a temple of Graeco-Tuscan style. In the interior the wall of the *cella* is sunk with seven deep recesses, three of them apsidal, which are fronted by pairs of columns and flanked by pilasters. See Figs. 64, 65 *infra*.


Circular  
temples.

819. The differences of plan detailed above, with reference to rectangular Roman temples, were the least serious of the blemishes which corrupted the pure beauty of the Greek ideal. Each of the architectural orders, though in a different respect, suffered under the hand of the unappreciative Roman. The Corinthian was perhaps, in the first instance, least injuriously affected, for its inherent elaborateness, appealing as it did to Roman taste, appears less immediately to have suggested opportunities for perverse alteration. Accordingly, it was less impaired than the Ionic, for example, by additional elaboration and further ostentation of design; but even here perverse ingenuity was not long in finding scope.

Orders.

820. The Doric style in Roman hands lost the massive dignity and grandeur which characterised it in Greece, being, it is probable, adversely influenced by the Tuscan style. The column, which was sometimes provided with a base consisting of a square plinth, a *tōrus*, and an *apophýgē*, was sometimes slender, circular, and unfluted, sometimes bevelled as if for fluting (Vitruvius, iv 3, 9). It was originally fluted above (say) one third of its height. Often a small round moulding (*astrāgal*) separated neck and shaft, or, sometimes, the neck was simply left unfluted. The *ēchinus* of the capital was much smaller than in

Roman-Doric  
order.



Roman-Doric order.

Fig. 55. Theatre of Marcellus. After Canina, iii, tav. 106.

Greek examples. It had small receding rectangular fillets (*quadrae*) below it, instead of the projecting fillets (*annuli*) common on its surface in Greek examples. The edge of the *ābācus* was usually moulded. The entablature was low, the architrave being considerably reduced, and when (as occasion-

ally) triglyphs were absent, it was divided into *fasciae*. Two or more triglyphs may occur over each intercolumniation, and, according to Vitruvius, the end-triglyph was placed over the axis of the column beneath, so that the frieze at each corner of the building terminated in a half-metope. The cornice was reduced in importance, not undercut, and sometimes supported by modillions. Mutules occur, if there is a triglyph frieze, but usually only over the triglyphs, rosettes being placed over the metopes. Mutules are also placed beneath the sloping cornice of the pediment. In buildings where examples of the order have survived, the columns are usually engaged, that is, are placed against a wall: for example the Tabularium (78 B.C.), the theatre of Marcellus (13 B.C.), and the Colosseum (80 A.D.) (see below, § 834). For the theatre of Marcellus, see Fig. 55.

821. In buildings of **IONIC** style the base usually takes the Attic form of an upper and lower *torus* divided by a channel (*scōtia*), with the addition of a plinth below. The shaft has fewer flutes, Roman-Ionic  
order. twenty, not twenty-four, or is unfluted. The presence of fluting appears to depend on the material of the column. Granite and cipollino were left unfluted, the former being too hard to be worked in flutes, the latter too liable to flake off. The capital, apart from the volutes, is reduced in height by the narrowing of the channel (*cānālīs*) above the *ovolo* or *ēchinus*, and in beauty by the consequent omission of the curved string-course which formed that channel's lower edge. A further development was the placing of volutes on all four faces of the capital. Hence the volutes often project diagonally, as, for example, in the case of the temple of Saturn in the Roman Forum. The volutes, and the parts between them, were sometimes decorated with foliage (Fig. 56). The entablature, which retained with slight modification the features of the Greek order, was



Fig. 56. Roman-Ionic capital. Canina, iii, tav. 68 D.

overloaded with carved decorative mouldings, and the treatment of the sculptured frieze served to betray the architect's artistic incompetence. Thus, in the case of the temple of 'Fortuna Virilis', in the Forum Boarium, it was loaded with heavy festoons supported by candelabra and ox-skulls and by figures of boys disproportionately small, a method of decoration which showed a lack both of taste and imagination (Fig. 57). The temple of 'Fortuna Virilis' (214 B.C.), the second order of the theatre of Marcellus (13 B.C.) and of the Colosseum (80 A.D.), and the temple of Saturn (284 A.D.), present the most interesting examples.




Fig. 57. Roman-Ionic order. Entablature etc. of Temple of 'Fortuna Virilis'. Canina, iii, tav. 56.



822. Of the Greek orders, the **Corinthian** flourished most vigorously on Italian soil. In Greece it never achieved great popularity, in spite of the beauty of the examples designed in the latter half of the fourth century. In Italy it became the national style and in some cases, for example the Pantheon, the temple of Antoninus and Faustina (141 and 161 A.D.), and especially the temple of Castor (7 B.C.), was treated with conspicuous success. Being essentially

Roman-  
Corinthian  
order.




Fig. 58. Roman-Corinthian order. Temple of Castor and Pollux.  
Canina, iii, tav. 25.

a florid style, it was well suited to Roman taste. The entablature had no special features which distinguished it from that of the Ionic order, unless the vertical fluting applied to the cornice in the case of the temples of Castor and of Antoninus and Faustina is to be so regarded. The developments of the capital unfortunately were not always so happy as in the case of that temple, where the interlacing of the central *helices* forms a new and not unpleasing feature. One peculiarly tasteless development was that

sometimes classed as a separate order, namely the **Composite**, being regarded as a combination of Ionic and Corinthian<sup>1</sup>. In this the corner *helices* were very considerably enlarged, and an *ovolo* ornamented with the egg-and-dart pattern was borrowed from the Ionic capital and placed above the two rows of acanthus leaves. The earliest examples known belong to the temple of Jupiter at Aizani (first century B.C.?) and the Arch of Titus




Fig. 59. Composite capital from the Arch of Titus. Canina, iii, tav. 71 A.

(Fig. 59), but specimens belonging to the second and third centuries A.D. are common. Even more extraordinary was the introduction of sculptured animals, weapons and so forth amongst or above the acanthus foliage, as in the case of the temple of Concord, where rams took the place of the *helices* at the angles (Fig. 60); and, again, of human figures, as in capitals

<sup>1</sup> Anderson and Spiers, however (ed. 1907, p. 154), regard the Composite as a legitimate development of the Ionic order, the successive stages of evolution being (1) Ionic capital with *anthemion* necking, as e.g. in the Erechtheum; (2) Ionic capital with *acanthus* necking, as in the temple of Zeus at Aizani; (3) Composite capital.

from the Baths of Caracalla, sometimes utterly disproportionate to the size of the capital.



Fig. 60. Corinthian capital from the Temple of Concord. W. J. Anderson and R. P. Spiers, *Architecture of Greece and Rome*, p. 178, ed. 1907.

823. Columnar architecture was employed not only for temples, as already stated, but also for basilicas, porticoes, and other public buildings; sometimes, as in triumphal arches, in conjunction with the arch (§ 830). Basilicas (halls used as law-courts and exchanges) were oblong in plan and sometimes divided into aisles by rows of pillars which served to support galleries for spectators. An apse containing the tribunal was placed at one or both ends of the building if required. The earliest example was the Basilica Porcia, built by M. Porcius Cato B.C. 184. Further, the column was sometimes used singly as a memorial to a distinguished person, being in these cases assignable to no particular order. Thus, the naval victory of Dülilius over the Carthaginians (261 B.C.) was commemorated by the

Use of  
columnar  
architecture.




Fig. 61. 'Pont du Gard' near Nîmes (Baldinger, after a photograph).



*columna rostrata*, adorned with the beaks of ships, in the Roman Forum; and the Dacian victories of Trajan, by a huge column 124 feet high, erected in Trajan's Forum 113 A.D., which supported a statue of the emperor, while the shaft is decorated by a spiral relief representing his campaigns. Similar is the column of Marcus Aurelius, 122 feet high, in the Piazza Colonna, commemorating and picturing his war with the Marcomanni.

824. The use of columnar architecture for a purely decorative, as opposed to a constructive, purpose appears to have been peculiarly Roman. Thus, the exteriors of theatres and amphitheatres were adorned with ranges of engaged columns, the lowest Doric, the next Ionic, the third Corinthian, each of the upper tiers standing on the entablature of the one beneath it. Here, as in the case of triumphal arches, the columns are used in conjunction with the arch, and, like those in the inside of the *cella* of a Roman temple, are not an essential part of the structure. In such cases, an entablature projects from the wall proper, to excuse their presence; and this entablature is at times employed to bear statues and other adornments. It is 'returned' and interrupted at will. Occasionally, small pediments, round or broken, are employed to relieve the monotony of the decorative entablature. When there are arches in the main wall, they usually spring from low pilasters placed at each side of the decorative columns, which are of such a height that their entablature passes above the crown of the arch. This is the system followed in the theatre of Marcellus, the Colosseum, and the triumphal arches. In the last named the columns are frequently set upon a plinth and arranged in pairs.

825. The Romans appear to have appreciated the beauty of the arch, which, in one form or another, became the dominant feature of their architecture, and possibly to have recognised in particular the aesthetic value of the arch-form, when many times repeated, as in the exterior of the Colosseum. But, be that as it may, it cannot be denied that they fully realised its utility as a means of saving material in a structure which would otherwise have been built solid, of relieving pressure on architraves and lintels, and of bridging spaces which could not be spanned by other means. Thus the arch was extensively employed in the construction of aqueducts (the first Roman example of which, the Aqua Appia, was projected B.C. 312), not only where it was necessary to cross a stream or a road, but also when the aqueduct was passing through the open country. At Rome the Aqua Marcia (B.C. 144), now *Acqua Pia*, the Aqua Virgo (B.C. 20), now *Acqua Vergine*, the Aqua Claudia (A.D. 52), now *Acqua Felice*, and the Aqua Trajana (A.D. 111), now *Acqua Paola*, still suffice to supply the city with water. The 'Pont du Gard', near Nîmes (Nemausus) in the south of France (Fig. 61), is a famous provincial example. Very frequently the arch-form is present, though the arch-principle is not involved, for example in the vaults which form the ceilings of rooms in Pompeian houses, the larger vaults in public buildings

Use of the  
arch.

such as Baths and Basilicas, and domes like that of the Pantheon. In these cases the arch consists of a solid mass of concrete, faced (like the ancient concrete walls) with triangular bricks. Consequently there is no lateral thrust, and the only pressure involved is exerted vertically down-

**Materials.**

The extraordinary strength of Roman concrete was, in this and other connexions, of inestimable value to the architect and engineer, but there is reason to believe that it was not fully realised. At any rate, in the first century A.D., walls no more than seven inches thick were faced on both sides with triangular bricks set with an angle facing inwards (*opus testāceum*), and thicker examples were further divided at intervals by horizontal layers of rectangular *tegulae*, although the brick is much less durable than the concrete (Fig. 62). Other methods of




Fig. 62. Concrete wall faced with triangular bricks, and divided at intervals, by horizontal layers of rectangular tegulae. From J. H. Middleton's *Remains of Ancient Rome*, i 57 (ed. 1892).

treating concrete walls were in vogue at an earlier date. Thus, in the second century B.C., the concrete was studded with rough pieces of tufa, volcanic stone (*opus incertum*), and in the Augustan age was faced with lozenge-shaped pieces of the same material (*opus reticulatum*), Fig. 63. Moreover, the facing of the wall in this way was not intended to improve its appearance, for such walls were very generally further covered with stucco or with marble slabs (*crustae*). Walls were never built of solid concrete or of solid brick. Marble and granite were rarely used except for *crustae*, columns, and entablatures; and travertine stone, a kind of limestone<sup>1</sup>, was employed only for a comparatively small number of buildings.

<sup>1</sup> The name *travertino*, *tibertino* or *tiburtino*, is derived from *lapis Tiburtinus*, a white concretionary limestone, deposited by the waters of the Anio, at *Tibur*.

Vitruvius, in writing of stone walls built of rectangular masonry (*opus quadratum*), recognises various classes:—*isodōmum*, in which the courses




Fig. 63. 'Opus incertum' and 'opus reticulatum'. From J. H. Middleton, *l. c.*, i 52.

are of regular depth, *pseudisodomum*, in which the depth of the courses is irregular, and *emplecton*, in the Italian examples of which the wall was cased with stone but filled in the centre with rubble (ii 8, 5—7).

826. The existing remains of Roman temples belong mostly to the Corinthian order. The temple of **Hercules at Cora** in Latium, which is ascribed to the first century B.C., serves to exemplify the use of the Roman-Doric order in temple architecture. A flight of nineteen steps lead to the front of a *podium*, on which stands a deep tetrastyle portico, having two columns between the columns at each angle and the front of the *cella*. Pilasters decorate the exterior of the side walls of the *cella*, which is oblong. The columns are of a height out of all proportion to their diameter and to the height of the entablature, which has been reduced by the narrowing of the architrave to about one-third of the height of the frieze. They have bases, and, for one-third of their height, are polygonal, being chamfered as if for fluting, whilst, above that height, they are fluted as far as the necking, which is left round. The capitals are insignificant. Three triglyphs occur above each intercolumniation, and there are mutules below the sloping cornice of the pediment. The ceiling of the portico was evidently of wood.

827. The best example of an Ionic temple in Rome is that of **Fortuna Virilis**, the remains of which probably date from 214 B.C. It is tetrastyle

Existing  
remains of  
Roman-Doric  
temples.

and pseudoperipteral, two-thirds of the *podium*, which was about 8 feet high, being assigned to the *cella*, and the remaining one-third to the portico, the intercolumniations of which were built up on the conversion of the temple into the Church of S. Maria Egiziaca. The whole building was covered externally with hard stucco (*opus albarium*) and painted, and the various mouldings of the entablature, as well as the relief-work of the frieze, were modelled in the same material. Other details of the order have been described above (§ 821).

828. The remains of the (Ionic) temple of **Saturn** in the Forum, which belong to the last rebuilding of the temple, by Diocletian, about 284 A.D., may serve to illustrate both the carelessness and the tastelessness of late Roman work. The columns standing are six of grey and two of red granite, and are unfluted. They probably had been used before, for some of them are now placed upside-down. Some are monoliths, others are not. Some are set upon plinths, whilst in other cases the base stands directly upon the stylobate. The capitals have volutes on all four faces and consequently all the volutes project diagonally; there are no bolsters, and the sides, front, and back of the capital are similar. The *cānālis* above the *ovolo* is entirely omitted, and the volutes are considerably reduced in size. The *ovolo* rests upon a convex moulding or *tōrus*, carved with a rope-pattern, the lower edge of which is on a level with the lowest part of each volute. Beneath this again is a *cyma* carved with acanthus (?) leaves resting on the small *tōrus* (*astrāgal*), which tops the shaft. The entablature, which is surmounted by dentils below the modillions or brackets supporting the cornice, is quite plain, save for an inscription, and is not divided into architrave and frieze.

829. Of temples built in the Corinthian style instances are very numerous.

Existing  
remains of  
Roman-  
Corinthian  
temples.

The following may be mentioned as being, for one reason or another, of special interest. The temple of **Mater Matuta**, formerly called the temple of **Vesta**, in the Forum Boarium, appears to belong to a rebuilding in the time of Augustus. It is circular and peripteral. Of the twenty columns one is now missing, together with the whole of the entablature, and the upper part of the *cella*-wall. With the exception of the substructure, the temple throughout consists of Parian marble, the walls being built of solid blocks of this material, instead of being merely faced with *crustae* in the usual manner. The *cella*-wall is pierced by a door with a window on each side of it. The temple 'of **Vesta**' at **Tibur**, which dates from the end of the Republic, was of similar plan and is also to a large extent preserved. In this case the walls of the *cella* are of *opus incertum* (see above), and the frieze is decorated with *boucrānia*, festoons, and rosettes. The three columns and the fragment of the fine entablature of Pentelic marble, still standing at the south-east side of the temple of **Castor** in the Forum, are of Augustan date. The temple, which was *octostyle* and *peripteral*, and was



fronted by a portico of considerable depth, stood upon a *podium* 22 feet high, which was relieved by pilasters standing one below each column, in addition to the usual cornice and base mouldings. The *hexastyle* temple of **Augustus and Livia at Vienne** (like the 'Maison Carrée' at Nîmes, and the Pantheon in Rome) has the distinction of being one of the three Roman temples which are in the most perfect state of preservation. It stands on a comparatively low *podium*, and possesses a deep portico, and a *cella* flanked by *alae* much after the 'Tuscan fashion, although the space of one intercolumniation at each side is occupied by a return of the back wall decorated with pilasters. Some of the main features of the **Pantheon** (Figs. 64, 65) have been described above (§ 818). The *octostyle* portico




Fig. 64. Plan of Pantheon and part of the Thermae of Agrippa.

From J. H. Middleton, *l. c.*, ii 127.

through which the circular *cella* is entered displays three columns and two pilasters on each side. It is divided into three aisles, by the insertion of two columns between each of the *antae* flanking the entrance to the *cella* and the third and sixth columns respectively of the front. Each of the side-aisles terminates in an apsidal niche, against the outer wall of which the pilasters above mentioned are set. The columns are of red and grey Egyptian granite and are consequently unfluted, whilst their capitals are of Pentelic marble. An inscription on the frieze, which is otherwise plain,

records the building of the Pantheon by Agrippa in 27 B.C.<sup>1</sup>, and another on the architrave its restoration by Severus and Caracalla in 202 A.D. The ceiling of the portico was of gilt bronze. To the description of the *cella* already given one or two facts may be added. On the exterior, the wall, which is of concrete lined with brick, was divided by horizontal cornices into three stories, the two upper of which were coated with stucco, whilst the lower was faced with *crustae* of white marble, as are still the short side-walls of the portico. The roof was covered with tiles of gilt bronze. The *cella*, which is entered through massive doors of bronze, once plated with gold, depends for light on a circular opening, 27 feet in diameter, in the centre of the dome. The inner surface of the dome is sunk with panels (*lēcūnāria*), once magnificently decorated. Below, the walls



Fig. 65. Interior of the Pantheon. From Banister Fletcher's *History of Architecture*, Fig. 55 (after Piranesi), showing the original marble panelling immediately below the coffered ceiling.

were splendidly lined with various marbles and porphyry, and were fronted by two orders of columns of coloured marble, supporting entablatures and, in the case of the lower range, standing before recesses. It remains to add a few words as to the date and nature of the building. Formerly regarded as a part of the *Thermae* of Agrippa, it has been shown to have no connexion therewith<sup>2</sup>. Recent researches by the Austrian Dell, the Frenchman Chedanne, the Italians Armanini and Beltrami, and the German Durm have made it probable (1) that the original temple erected by Agrippa (27 B.C.) to Mars, Venus, and other mythical ancestors of Augustus was an oblong *cella* with a decastyle portico facing south, and

<sup>1</sup> On the date of the *existing* building, see p. 543.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. Lanciani in the *Notizie degli scavi* for August 1882, and Middleton, ii 126.

that in front of it was a large circular piazza, the wall of which was concentric with that of the later Rotunda; (2) that this piazza was replaced by the existing Pantheon, which is proved by its brick-stamps to have been wholly the work of Hadrian (120—124 A.D.), and was terminated on the north by a façade including the extant doorway with its two side-niches; (3) that subsequently, at some date prior to that of Septimius Seuerus, Agrippa's temple was pulled down and its materials together with the dedicatory inscription used in the construction of the present octostyle portico of the Pantheon<sup>1</sup>.

830. Of the eight columns of the *hexastyle* portico of the temple of **Vespasian** in the Forum, built by Domitian about 94 A.D., three remain standing at the north-east angle and support a small part of the entablature. On the frieze are sculptured ox-skulls and sacrificial implements, and the entablature is otherwise richly decorated. Six columns were ranged on a dado at each side of the interior of the *cella*. The '**Maison Carrée**' at Nîmes (Figs. 66, 67), ascribed to the time of Hadrian, is *hexastyle* and *pseudo-peripteral*, and the portico has a depth of three intercolumniations. The *podium*, which is eleven feet high, is reached by nineteen steps. The



Fig. 66. The '**Maison Carrée**' at Nîmes. After Paul Joanne's *Dictionnaire Géographique de la France* (from a photograph supplied by the *Commission des monuments historiques*).

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Jordan-Hülsem, *Topographie der Stadt Rom*, iii 586 f, and especially Armanini and Beltrami, *Il Panteon*, 1898, and Durm, *Die Baukunst der Römer*<sup>2</sup>, p. 550 ff.

temple of **Antoninus and Faustina**, built by Antoninus Pius in 141 A.D. in honour of his wife, and re-dedicated after his death to himself as well, still exists, so far as concerns the *podium*, the ten columns of the hexastyle




Fig. 67. Plan of 'Maison Carrée', Nîmes. Canina, iii, tav. 55.

portico, and part of the *cella*-wall and the entablature. The columns are monoliths of cipollino (Carystian marble); the frieze, of white Athenian marble, is sculptured with griffins and candelabra; the *cella*-wall is of peperino, and was formerly covered with *crustae* of white marble.

**831.** Extant examples of **Triumphal Arches**, that is to say arches of honour set up to commemorate military or other services, are exceedingly common. The earliest is that at St Remy (Glanum), associated with Julius Caesar; the latest, that at Rheims, assigned to Julianus, 360 A.D. In Rome itself the arches set up in honour of Titus (70 A.D.), of Septimius Severus (203 A.D.)<sup>1</sup>, and of Constantine (311 A.D.), are the most perfectly preserved specimens. Most commonly the monument consists (as does the Arch of Titus) of a single arch between massive piers, against which are set decorative columns, standing on a *podium* and supporting an entablature and cornice (which passes above the crown of the arch) and sometimes a pediment. Above this is a massive *podium* inscribed with the dedication, and on the top of the whole structure might be placed a chariot-group. The sides of the archway, the spandrels of the arch, the frieze, and other flat surfaces were frequently adorned with reliefs<sup>2</sup>, and statues were placed above the decorative columns. Often, however, the arch is triple, each of the piers being penetrated by a subsidiary arch lower and narrower than that in the centre. The arches of Septimius Severus and of Constantine are examples of this

Triumphal  
arches.

<sup>1</sup> See Fig. 87 in § 845 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> See Fig. 82 in § 843 *infra*.



arrangement. Again, as in the former of these instances, the central piers may contain transverse arches connecting the others. In the case of these arches, and generally, the plan of the monument is oblong, but sometimes, as for the arch of Marcus Aurelius at Tripoli, and that of Caracalla at Tebessa, a square plan is adopted and a four-way arch designed after the manner of the arch of Janus Quadrifrons in the Velabrum, Rome.

832. A general description of a **basilica** has been given above (§ 823). The chief existing remains, apart from mere foundations, belong to the basilica begun by Maxentius and completed by Constantine, which was of exceptional plan. It consisted of a central hall more than 80 feet wide, vaulted in three bays, from each side of which opened off three vaulted chambers or transepts 68 feet wide. The central chamber on each side terminated in an apse. The north-east side of this building remains with the vaulting complete, a splendid illustration of the use of concrete. The ordinary type of basilica determined the form of many Christian churches.

Basilicas.

833. Roman **Baths** (*balneae, thermae*) are represented by considerable remains, both in Rome and in the provinces. These belong chiefly to the enormous and luxurious structures of Imperial times. From them, and from the Vitruvian description of the Roman *balneae*, we gather that the essential chambers, in addition to the furnace-room, were three in number, and that these were usually duplicated for the accommodation of both sexes, the furnace-room being placed between the two sets of compartments. The essential rooms were the *tepidarium*, which was heated with warm air to encourage perspiration after undressing, the *caldarium*, where the hot bath was taken in a tub (*sōlium*) or basin (*piscīna*), and the *frigidarium* where the final cold bath was taken. The *frigidarium*, naturally, was placed furthest from the furnace-room, and the *caldarium* nearest to it. The furnace (*propugnēum, praefurnium*), in small examples, heated the water in bronze cisterns from which the various rooms were supplied. The overflow from the cold cistern passed into the tepid one and that from the latter into the hot cistern which was closest to the furnace. In the great *thermae* the water was heated in a series of basins (*piscīnae*) by means of hollow floors and flues set in their sides. These hollow floors (*hypocausta, suspensūrae*), invented by Sergius Orata about 100 B.C., which occur generally under *caldaria* and *tepidaria*, and were used in some private houses, were usually supported by short pillars (*pilae*). To the three rooms above mentioned there was usually added an *apodytērion* or, as we should put it, a dressing-room, and often a *Lacōnīcum*, or hot-air bath, circular in plan, the temperature of which could be regulated by raising or lowering a bronze *clipeus*, which covered an opening in the centre of its dome. In the magnificent imperial *thermae* there were other rooms in great number, lounges (*exēdrae*), ante-rooms, halls, lecture-rooms, libraries and *xysti* for exercise. The most interesting remains are those of the baths at Pompeii, and of the *thermae* of Caracalla and of Diocletian in

Baths.

Rome. In the case of the baths of Diocletian, the *tepidarium*, and a circular chamber next to it, were converted by Michelangelo into the nave and vestibule of the church of S. Maria degli Angeli. Mutilated as they are, the remains of these baths still serve to give some idea of the size and magnificence of the imperial *thermae*. For a restoration of the interior of the *thermae* of Caracalla, see Fig. 68, and, for the ground-plan, Fig. 69.



Fig. 68. Interior of the 'Thermae' of Caracalla. From a drawing by R. Phéné Spiers (Anderson and Spiers, *l. c.*, p. 248).




Fig. 69. Plan of the 'Thermae' of Caracalla. After Canina, iii, tav. 147.

834. Amphitheatres remain in a fair state of preservation at Rome (the Colosseum), Pompeii, Capua, Verona, Nîmes and Arles.

The Colosseum, which was built chiefly by Vespasian, Titus and Domitian (and consequently known as the Amphitheatrum Flauium), and partly by Severus Alexander and Gordianus III, is the largest of these (measuring 622 feet by 528 and covering nearly six acres of ground). This will serve to give a general idea of the methods of construction adopted in all cases. Oval in plan, it had tiers of seats rising in ranges about an oval arena. These were supported by walls, which radiated from the high *podium* enclosing the arena, and were joined one with another by vaulting at one, two, or three levels, according to the distance from the arena and the increasing height of the ranges of seats above its level (Fig. 70). Numerous stairways were placed between these walls to lead to the various ranges of seats, and were connected horizontally by the passages (four at the ground-level) concentric with the arena which pierced the walls

Amphi-  
theatres.

transversely and ran round the whole building. The seats of honour were upon the level top of the *podium*. Above it was the range devoted to senators and magistrates, then that of the knights, and thirdly, raised considerably above the knights' seats, the range for other citizens. Above this again was a colonnade under which were seats portioned off for women




Fig. 70. Section of the Colosseum. From Hirt, *Geschichte der Baukunst*, t. 20, 10.

I, II, III, IV, the four stories of the exterior. A, the arena. B, the podium. C, D, E, F, the four corridors. G, H, I, the three *maeniana*, or stories of seats. K, upper gallery. L, terrace above K. R, terrace for the managers of the *uelarium*. Z, external steps. *a*, stairs from third corridor to the podium. *b*, steps from the podium to the first *maenianum* (G). *c, d*, stairs from the ground story to the second story. *e*, steps to the first *praecinctio*. *f*, steps to the second *maenianum* (H). *g*, stairs from the corridors of the second story to the second *maenianum*, through the *uomitorium a* (near H). *h*, stairs from the floor of the second story, leading to upper stairs *delta* etc. *i*, stairs from the second story to the middle story (*entresol*). *j*, passage leading to the third *maenianum* (I). *k*, stairs leading to the upper part of I and to the gallery K. *m*, steps from K to the terrace L. *n*, steps from the terrace to the top. *o, p*, openings lighting the two corridors F and E. *q*, inner wall of the second corridor D. *s*, windows of the middle story. *t*, windows of the gallery. *v*, rest, and *w*, loop, for the mast (*gamma*) of the *uelarium*.

and for the common people. On the exterior the amphitheatre presented four stories, the three lower of which were formed by continuous arcades of eighty arches, whilst that at the top consisted of a wall pierced by forty



windows. The stories were separated by entablatures supported by ranges of 80 engaged columns each standing against the piers between the arches and resting, in the case of the upper ranges, on pedestals. The lowest order was Doric, the second Ionic, the third Corinthian. Above this last are Corinthian pilasters set against the wall of the fourth story and surmounted by an entablature and a bold cornice nearly 160 feet above the ground. The cornice is pierced with holes above a series of corbels projecting from the wall to support masts upon which an awning (*velarium*) was extended to shelter the spectators from rain and sun. The arena itself, which was about fifteen feet below the level of the top of the *podium*, could be entered from the innermost concentric passage, and directly from the exterior of the building by passages in a line with the axes of the ellipse. Its floor was supported by extensive substructures, which apparently contained both the dens of the wild beasts, and the various mechanical contrivances for scenic transformations, including the flooding of the arena with water. The materials employed for the building of the Colosseum were chiefly travertine, tufa, and brick-faced concrete. Marble stucco covered the exterior, and the sides and vaulting of the passages. Marble was used for paving, seats and ornamental purposes.

Before the building of the Colosseum, amphitheatres had been built partly or entirely of wood. That of Statilius Taurus, B.C. 30, in the Campus Martius was partly of stone. It was destroyed by fire, and therefore, probably, the seats and staircases were of wood. The earlier examples, that of C. Scribonius Curio, 50 B.C. (said to have been composed of two theatres set on pivots and reversible), that of Julius Caesar, 46 B.C., and that built by Atilius at Fidenae during the reign of Tiberius, were made entirely of wood, and perished by fire or collapse.

On Theatres see §§ 800—804; on Aqueducts see above, § 825.

The most useful works bearing on Roman Architecture are: Middleton, *Remains of Ancient Rome*, ed. 1892; Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*; Hülsen, *The Roman Forum*, 1909; Mau-Kelsey, *Pompeii, Its Life and Art*, 1909; Anderson and Spiers, *Architecture of Greece and Rome*, ed. 2, 1907; Banister Fletcher and B. F. Fletcher, *History of Architecture*, ed. 5, 1905; and J. Durm, *Handbuch der Architektur*, Zweiter Teil (Die Baustile), 2 Band (*Die Baukunst der Etrusker. Die Baukunst der Römer*), ed. 2, Stuttgart 1905, pp. xii, 784 with 865 figs. H. B. Walters, *The Art of the Romans*, 1911, chapter ii ('Roman Architecture'), has a useful table of dated examples on p. 44.

Bibliography.

## VII. 2. SCULPTURE.

835. So far as our present knowledge allows us to decide, Roman Sculpture cannot be said to have existed before the second century B.C. We learn, from literary sources, that works of sculpture existed in Rome long before this period; but, so far, no monuments have been discovered to enable us to appreciate the style or to illustrate the development of the art. Pliny (xxxiv 28 f.) tells us that in Rome there were statues of Attus Navius, by the *Curia*, of Cloelia and Horatius Cocles, and of the predecessors of Tarquinius Priscus, on the Capitol. This last statement is confirmed by Appian (*B. C.* i 16), who relates that Tiberius Gracchus was slain at the entrance to the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus near the statues of the kings. Statues of Pythagoras and Alcibiades were erected *in cornibus comitii* during the Samnite War (c. 343 B.C.); these statues were possibly Greek in style, since they were erected in accordance with an oracle of Apollo Pythius (Plin. xxxiv 26). Honorary statues were set up in the *Forum*; those of Junius and Coruncanius, the envoys killed by Teuta, Queen of Illyricum, in 230 B.C., were three feet high (*ib.* 24). The material of these statues was almost certainly bronze. Pliny not only mentions them under the head of bronze statuary, but also remarks that, in 158 B.C., according to Piso, all statues round the *Forum* not erected by a decree of the people or Senate were removed, while that of Spurius Cassius in the *Aedes Telluris* was melted down (*ib.* 30). He also tells us (*ib.* 15) that the first bronze statue made at Rome was that made in honour of Ceres out of the confiscated property of Sp. Cassius (484 B.C.). If this is correct, the earlier statues must have been of wood or terracotta, or of stone such as *tufa* or *peperino*. Pliny further speaks (*ib.* 33) of a native Italian art of statuary represented at Rome by a Hercules attributed to Euander, and a Janus assigned to Numa; their material is not certain. Tarquinius Priscus was said to have summoned an artist named Vulca from Veii to make a terracotta Jupiter for the Capitol (Plin. xxxv 157); and it is also remarked that till the conquest of Asia (133 B.C.) the cult-statues in temples were of wood or terracotta (Plin. xxxiv 34). Of this character are probably the figures from Falerii in the Villa Papa Giulio. Architectural terracottas from temples are frequently found in Italy, e.g. those from Falerii and Concha in the same Museum. There is reason to believe that this early sculpture in Rome was not a spontaneous native art, but dependent on Etruscan and Greek sources. The summoning of an artist from Veii and the erection of statues of Pythagoras and Alcibiades offer at least some ground for this belief. It is perhaps possible to hold that in the famous bronze *Arringatore* at Florence, which was found near Lake Trasimene, we have a late example of an Etrusco-Roman portrait-statue. This work, which dates from the period of

Early Roman  
statues.

the Punic Wars, bears an Etruscan inscription stating that this statue of one Metilius was ordered by his widow Aulesi Clensi from the sculptor Tenine Tuthines. This and its discovery in Etruria point to Etruscan influence. On the other hand, the manner in which the drapery is handled, without any regard to the beauty of form, and the very careful rendering of minor detail indicate the Roman love for uncompromising accuracy.

Other specimens of this hybrid art are to be seen in the fragments of



Fig. 71. Bronze 'Camillus'. Palazzo de' Conservatori, Rome  
(photographed by Vasari).

the monument of the *Tibicines* preserved in the Magazzino Archeologico at Rome. The most interesting of these is a small statue representing Orpheus. He is shown as a nude youth seated on a tree trunk. His head is wreathed and thrown back, as though in the act of singing; his left hand seems to have held a *cithara*, and round his feet are various animals. This group, which, in spite of its rude execution, is not devoid of grace, is of *peperino* coated with stucco and painted. It is of the Sullan period. Somewhat earlier in date are the Pompeian sculptured capitals, which are worked in *tufa*. Again, in the Museum at Capua there is a series of votive statuettes, also in *tufa*, representing a female deity. This series begins in the second or third century B.C. (if not earlier), and continues to the age of Sulla. We probably have another example of this Greek art in Italy under the Republic in the bronze *Camillus* (Fig. 71) in the Palazzo de' Conservatori in Rome. The subject is, indeed, Roman, but in execution and style it is Greek, and seems to be derived from some work of the Periclean period. But this art (as said above) was, at its best, a hybrid. And the art that was patronised by the circle of the younger Scipio, that was encouraged by the wholesale importations of conquerors, like Scaurus, Mummius, and Lucullus, was entirely exotic. Its sole result was to create in Rome a school of Greek sculptors, the school that is always associated with the name of Pasiteles. There are, however, two branches of sculpture which are almost exclusively Roman:—Portrait Busts, and Historical Reliefs. But it is exceedingly likely that most of the sculptors working in Rome were always Greeks.

836. To obtain a clear view of the development of Roman Sculpture, let us follow each of these subjects in turn in a chronological order, which has been rendered possible by various means. As regards portrait busts, we have coins bearing imperial heads which have led to the busts of many of the emperors and empresses being identified with certainty. With their aid, private busts, similar in style or in the fashion of wearing the hair, can be assigned to a certain period. Lastly, the law of the growth of the bust, as determined by Bienkowski, helps us to fix the proper period of any bust that is unbroken. He has shown that, under the Republic and in the Augustan age, the bust includes only the part just below the collar-bone. By the Flavian period, it extends to the shoulders. In the time of Trajan, the whole shoulder and the upper part of the chest are shown. Under Hadrian, part of the upper arm is added. During the Antonine age, the bust includes the whole of the chest and upper arm. In the early third century, the bust grows to be a half-figure showing the whole of the right arm and the body to the navel.

The dating of Historical Reliefs is less complicated, since in many cases we know to what monuments they belong, and therefore can date them within a few years. Again, if the emperor or the scene represented can be identified, a date can be assigned to them, at least conjecturally.

Historical  
reliefs.



837. At Rome it was the custom to model in wax masks (*imāgines*) from the faces of distinguished men after death. These were preserved by their relations and descendants for use in funeral ceremonies; and, as a rule, were kept in the *atrium*. The *ius imaginum* was a privilege of the nobility, and the *imāgines* were in fact a family portrait-gallery. In time, apparently toward the end of the second century B.C., marble busts began to replace these waxen masks. In the earliest of these republican busts, we can readily observe the influence of the wax technique. The bust includes the head, throat and neck as far as the collar-bone, and is modelled so as to reproduce merely the actual shape of the subject. All details that would give 'colour', such as the hair, the eyebrows, and the iris of the eye, are omitted: they were probably added in paint. These busts, for all their smooth, accurate modelling, lack life and spirit. Busts of this style may be easily recognised in Museums, where they are usually labelled 'Cato' or 'Scipio'. By degrees, more and more of a marble technique was developed; the style itself became more lifelike and natural. The busts of this period, which in Museums are labelled 'Pompey', 'Cicero', or 'Sulla', are remarkable for their excellence as portraits, due to the accurate modelling and the natural characterization; a fine example of this is the so-called 'Sulla', in the Braccio Nuovo of the Vatican (no. 60; Fig. 72).

Imagines  
maiorum.

Waxen masks.

Marble busts  
of the Roman  
Republic.




Fig. 72. 'Sulla'. Museo Vaticano (Vasari).

838. Under Augustus the free artistic development of Roman Sculpture was checked. In its place we have an exotic, academic Hellenism. Augustus forced on Rome, in art, as in litera-

Augustus.

ture, the splendid tradition of all that was best in Hellenism. It was his aim to purify and rejuvenate the world by purging its centre, Rome, of its vices, which were largely Hellenistic. Though this policy did not eventually succeed, it produced some of the grandest monuments of Rome. The portraits of Augustus are excellent examples of the result in Sculpture. In them, again, we have a Roman subject executed in the Greek style. The fixed look and the minute detail are Roman; but all character and spirit



Fig. 73. Augustus, Museo Vaticano (Vasari).

are lost in the ideal and heroic atmosphere in which they are set. The head of the Augustus from Prima Porta shows this clearly (Fig. 73). It is not Augustus himself, but what he wished to be, what he wished posterity to imagine that he was. The same dramatic idealism may be clearly seen in the female portraits of the period, especially those called, not without reason, Antonia. Tiberius and the other *principes* of the Julio-Claudian house neither cared, nor were able, to give this official art the patronage and support that might have kept it alive. Consequently, Roman portraiture during their reigns was haunted by this dead Hellenism. Gradually it struggles free, becoming more and more Roman as it forgoes Greek idealism. Portraits of Tiberius and Caligula are half Greek in style, those of Claudius are almost entirely Roman. A fine head in the Capitol (Fig. 74), wrongly named

The Julio-  
Claudian  
emperors.



Fig. 74. 'Brutus'. Museo Capitolino (Vasari).

Brutus, shows the resulting style, when Greek idealism was gone. The style is practically a throw-back to that of the Republic, except that this is a 'marble' and not a 'wax' style. Every detail is rendered with uncompromising frankness. This produces an accurate facial likeness, but no portrait: it is only the form of the man, and not the form and spirit combined. But, free at last to work out its own destiny, Roman Sculpture developed wonderfully, and under the Flavian dynasty reached the highest point it could attain. In portraiture the success of the Flavian artists is marvellous. There is still the same accurate modelling of the true Roman style, but added to this there are the subtle touches that give spirit and character, and make

The Flavian  
dynasty.

the marble appear to live. There are many Flavian busts in existence, several of them worthy to rank amongst the finest portraits in the world. In the Vespasian of the Capitol (Fig. 75) we have a good specimen of what




Fig. 75. Vespasian, of the Capitol (photographed by Mosconi).

these unknown artists could produce. The qualities of their art cannot be analysed and set out in detail. They worked with eyes that recognised instinctively the momentary expression that gave its subjects character, with hands that could unerringly reproduce it in marble. But they seem to have been more successful with male portraits than with female. For the Flavian female busts, recognisable at once by their high *toupet*s of curls, are with few exceptions inferior.

839. The reign of Trajan restored for a while the strenuous military spirit of Rome, and was a time of bold imperial enterprise.

Trajan.

This is not unnaturally reflected in the art of the period. Trajanic portraits are distinguished by a stern, almost wooden hardness. The fine feeling for texture, the subtle touch of life, are replaced by dryness in rendering and a desire to be natural, without being artistic. To Trajan

Hadrian.

succeeded another Hellenist, who attempted once again to reintroduce Greek tradition. In the portraits of Hadrian (Fig. 76, in the Capitol, *Imperator* 32), there is represented a Roman in a facile, but uninspired, Greek manner. The innumerable portraits and statues of his favourite Antinoüs, the few busts of his wife Sabina, all show this same dull, academic Hellenism. Apart from the style of the Hadrianic portraits, the many inscriptions of the artists of Aphrodisias, found in Rome, are further evidence of Greek influence in Rome during this period.



But the monotonous series of smooth spiritless copies from the villa at Tibur leaves no doubt that Greek Sculpture was dead. Nor could the imperial *poseur* revive it, and graft it on to Roman art. Under Antoninus Pius, Roman Sculpture had to free itself again from this baleful Greek influence, and then began to develop a

Antoninus  
Pius.



Fig. 76. Hadrian, of the Capitol (Moscioni).

style, of which the first symptoms had already appeared. This style, which is typical of the reigns of M. Aurelius, Commodus, and Septimius Seuerus, consists in the adaptation of pictorial principles to sculpture. In other words, though the Roman accuracy of modelling is preserved, the principal effect is derived from the play of light and shade. This result is obtained by polishing smooth surfaces, such as the cheeks; and by a free use of the drill in rough surfaces, as the hair and beard. Another sign of the same tendency is the plastic rendering of the eye. Till the time of Hadrian, the eye is either plain, or rendered merely by a semicircle. From the time of Hadrian onwards, the eye is plastically rendered by a circle, within which are two dots placed side by side. But this fashion of rendering the iris and pupil plastically did not become general till the Antonine age. The well-known bust of Commodus in the Palazzo de' Conservatori (Fig. 77) illustrates our meaning. In this the 'colouristic' effect of the technique is obvious. The light shining on the toned, polished, surface of the body imparts to it the warm appearance of flesh. The shadows in the countless deep-drilled holes of the hair and beard produce a dark colour and emphasize the difference in texture

M. Aurelius,  
Commodus,  
Sept. Seuerus.

Rendering of  
the eye.

between hair and skin. The resulting portrait is very good, but to paint in marble in this manner is not true sculpture. Still, for the greater part of



Fig. 77. Commodus. Palazzo de' Conservatori (Vasari).

the third century, this 'colouristic' principle is dominant in Roman art. The methods had to be changed after the time of Seuerus, since it became the fashion to wear the hair and beard clipped close. This lasted from Caracalla to Gallienus. The means adopted to produce the required pictorial effect is to render the hair and beard by innumerable pick-marks of the chisel on a roughened surface. These are sufficient to give the required effect of colour in short hair. Portraits of Pupienus show a combination of both methods, since he wore a long beard and short hair. This style was by no means incapable of good work. The magnificent bust of Philippus Arabs in the Vatican (Fig. 78, *Braccio Nuovo*, 124) is only one of many fine works of this period. It shows that the

Caracalla  
(211-7 A.D.).

Philippus  
Arabs  
(244-9 A.D.).

artists had lost none of the Roman skill in rendering character or in




Fig. 78. Philippus Arabs, of the Vatican.

accurate modelling. The bust, however, indicates a greater desire for a pictorial effect than for a living likeness. Gallienus reintroduced the fashion of wearing the hair and beard long. The busts of this emperor represent him with the beard and hair

Gallienus  
(253—268 A.D.).




Fig. 79. Private portrait (age of Gallienus). Magazzino Archeologico, Rome.

carefully brushed and arranged in a foppish manner. There are many private portraits, which can be assigned to this period, since they show the same fashion. One of these, in the Magazzino Archeologico in Rome (Fig. 79), will illustrate how the artists adapted their pictorial style to suit the fashion. The face is well modelled and the surface is polished. The hair is not quite so freely drilled as before, and the locks are treated more individually, and not as a mass of curls. These portraits are very natural, but the marble is less skilfully handled.

840. After the fall of Gallienus (268 A.D.), Sculpture seems to have



Fig. 80. Consul throwing the 'mappa'. Palazzo de' Conservatori (Anderson).



almost died out in Rome, and we have few portraits that can be assigned to the later third century. This is unfortunate, since we should like to possess portraits of Claudius Gothicus, Aurelian, Probus, and Diocletian, the men who saved the empire and civilisation, when both seemed almost at an end. The time of Constantine shows us the last stage of Roman Sculpture. The artists have almost lost control of their material; 'frontality', the absence of lateral curve in the axial line, is the dominant principle. Unconsciously they seem to achieve, in spite, or rather by means of these faults, what Riegl holds to be the main objective of sculpture, 'cubical individuality'. The statue of a consul throwing the *mappa* to start a chariot-race, now in the Palazzo de Conservatori (Fig. 80), will explain his meaning. Hitherto, all sculpture has had practically two dimensions, since only one side of a figure can be seen at once. But the solidity, the 'frontality' of these Constantinian sculptures makes it possible for the eye to grasp, though of course not to see, all sides at once. And thus the figure obtains its cubical character, and has artistically three dimensions.

Constantine.

841. Of Roman bronze statuary there are three famous examples, M. Aurelius on horseback on the Capitol, Septimius Seuerus at Brussels, and 'Theodosius' at Barletta. The M. Aurelius has been considerably restored; and, though dignified and effective as a monument, its artistic qualities cannot be commended. Of the Septimius Seuerus, the body is earlier, and is a fine example of one of the semi-nude *statuæ Achilleæ* of the first century of the Empire derived from Greek athletic types. The head is an ordinary portrait. The monumental beauty of the Colossus of Barletta is most striking, though the details are unpleasing. It illustrates very well one of the main objects of Sculpture, to reproduce its subject in a solid, cubical shape. The bronze bust called 'Brutus', in the Palazzo de' Conservatori, is in all probability a fine private portrait of the Hadrianic period. The only imperial bronze bust deserving of mention is the Titus in the Louvre; but this is not, after all, a very successful work.

Bronze statues of M. Aurelius, Sept. Seuerus, and 'Theodosius'.

Bronze busts of 'Brutus' and Titus.

842. Of temple sculptures in marble there are unfortunately no remains. But it is possible to obtain some idea of the composition and arrangement of Roman pediments from those figured on historical reliefs. We have such representations of the pediments of the temples of Iupiter Capitolinus, of Venus and Rome, of Quirinus, of Mars Ultor, and of the Magna Mater. Though the subject has not yet been properly studied, it is to be observed that, in composition and arrangement, Roman pediments followed the Greek model; but the symmetrical grouping of the figures is monotonous and artificial.

Roman pediments.

843. The origin of the Roman historical relief itself is still obscure. At least there is no view which commands general acceptance. Nor is it known when it became usual to ornament

Historical reliefs.



Fig. 81. Ara Pacis Augustae, from the east half of the south side

triumphal arches with sculptures. The earliest definite triumphal arch in Rome was the *Fornix Fabianus* of Fabius Allobrogicus built in 121 B.C. Of its decoration we know nothing. The arch of Augustus at Susa is hardly a triumphal arch, and that at Perugia is a city-gate. Both these monuments are in a local inferior Italian style, whose artists had not control of the material. The decoration of the arch of the Iulii at Saint-Remy (c. 50 B.C.) is statuesque in character and Greek in origin. Roman reliefs, then, are entirely confined to the Empire. The first great monument is the *Ara Pacis Augustae*, built by Augustus between B.C. 13 and B.C. 9. This building consisted of an altar within a high enclosure-wall pierced by two entrances. The outside of this wall was ornamented below with an acanthus-pattern and above with historical reliefs. These reliefs are the greatest achievement of Augustan art, and are by no means unworthy of a monument intended to symbolise all that Augustus had done for Rome. They also show the influence of the Hellenism of the age. The processions of the north and south sides are a Roman version of the Parthenon frieze. We see (Fig. 81) a procession of men walking in pairs, the one nearer the spectator in high relief, the other in low relief. The manner and composition are entirely Greek; but the procession and those composing it are Roman. The beauty and dignity obtained by this combination are unrivalled. Less successful is the rather spiritless relief of *Tellus* and the *Auræ* from the east wall; this is copied from some famous Hellenistic work and other replicas are known. Roman in character, and to some extent in style, are the sacrificial scenes from the east and west walls. In these we recognise the beginnings of the Roman efforts to give perspective in relief by putting that which is in the distance high in the background. More important is the fact that these scenes are practically groups, and thus are the first instances of the group-method of composition, which soon ousted the procession from historical reliefs. Unfortunately, for the long period that intervenes between the *Ara Pacis* and the Arch of Titus there is no extant monument; and the reliefs once believed to belong to the Arch of Claudius have been proved to be Trajanic.

*Ara Pacis  
Augustae.*

*Arch of Titus.*

In the two reliefs of the Arch of Titus (Fig. 82) we see the same processional composition. But here there is no Greek influence, and we recognise at once the true Flavian style, as in the portraits discussed above (§ 838). There is the same natural rendering of an expression that is momentary, but characteristic. The result is an 'impressionist' or 'illusionist' view of the procession seen in an imaginary frame. The magnificent modelling of the lictors' heads in low relief, the rhythm introduced by making some figures look back, and the blank open space above, give the whole a vivid reality and a natural beauty. In technical details there are one or two points to be noticed. The drill is used frequently, but not so frequently as to be too obvious; and, in the rendering of the *quadriga*, there is a noticeable error in perspective. In the relief of



Fig. 82. Relief from the Arch of Titus. Titus crowned by Victory in a quadriga driven by Roma (Vasari).



the Spoils of the Temple the heads of the *camilli* appear above the second row of figures. This is the beginning of a convention, that developed under Trajan, to represent a crowd by two or three rows of heads one above another. Some fragmentary reliefs in the Lateran, which some think Hadrianic, illustrate the growth of this convention under Domitian. The eight medallions that now adorn the Arch of Constantine (Fig. 83) probably belong to the last

Medallions  
on the  
Arch of  
Constantine



Fig. 83. Medallion from the Arch of Constantine (Anderson).

years of Domitian, though many authorities consider them Hadrianic. In these the height of decorative sculpture is reached. The composition is well balanced, and there is no monotonous repetition of the same motives. The figures and their heads are rendered with the naturalism we have learnt to expect from Flavian artists. (The head of the emperor has been replaced by a head of Constantine, in whose



Fig. 84. Relief from Trajan's forum, in Arch of Constantine (Anderson).

reign the *nimbus* was incised.) The artist, though the scene presented is not directly taken from nature, has lavished all his art in emphasizing the momentary and the characteristic to give the necessary life and atmosphere to his work. Otherwise, the result would have been dull and artificial. The beardless man to the emperor's left, in the lion-hunt scene here figured, is obviously a Flavian type. The drill observable in the drapery and foliage is paralleled by the Arch of Titus. The bearded man is no new phenomenon. Beards appear in the Arch of Titus and in that at Beneventum; and, during the first century, it was quite common for the lower classes to go unshaven. In the many reliefs, which record, like a marble epic, all the deeds wrought by Trajan for Rome, we find at once a more serious spirit. The eight slabs of a battle against barbarians taken from Trajan's *forum* to glorify the Arch of Constantine (Fig. 84) show a style remarkable for its stern realism. There is in them the same wooden hardness, the same inartistic naturalism that we find in Trajanic portraits. But, in the sweeping rush of the battle, the artists neglected various points. The eye has a tendency to be *en face* rather than in profile. We find three or four rows of heads. The perspective, which in general is much tortured, is extremely steep, as though the battle were being fought on a slope. Finally, careful examination will reveal that the forest of legs below does not correspond to the rows of heads above. But these faults may be overlooked in the glorious rush and splendid spirit of the work. The whole frieze is split up into several groups. The same peculiarities are observable in Trajan's Column, which is a long succession of scenes and groups forming a sculptured chronicle. Here, again, there is the same strained perspective, which in many cases is almost a bird's-eye view, and shows the beginning of another element in Roman art. And we often see three or four rows of heads. The other great monument of Trajanic art, the Arch at Beneventum, shows that the triumph of the group is complete. The reliefs of the piers and the attic are all groups; and it is noticeable that it is now rare to have more than one row of heads. In the reliefs of the archway, where we should expect processional scenes, are two rather large groups, which look like processions that have halted. The relief illustrated (Fig. 85) shows the sacrifice at Beneventum before Trajan's departure for the Parthian war:—*nuncupatio uotorum pro itu ac reditu*. It probably took place on the spot where the arch was afterwards erected. In these reliefs, as in the groups, there is little or no background above the heads of the figures.

Reliefs from  
Trajan's  
forum.

Trajan's  
Column.

The Arch at  
Beneventum.

844. For the Hadrianic period there are only some panels in the Palazzo de' Conservatori. These show the continuance of the group-treatment; and, unlike Hadrianic portraits, betray little or no Greek influence. In composition they are spiritless and artificial. The long and peaceful reign of

Panels of  
the age of  
Hadrian.



Fig. 85. Relief from the Arch of Trajan, Beneventum (Moscioni).



Antoninus Pius has left us no sculptured monuments of any importance. We may however bring into connexion with him the extant base of the column erected to his memory by M. Aurelius and L. Verus. The relief on the front represents the *consecratio* of the deceased emperor and Faustina taking

Base of the  
Antonine  
column.




Fig. 80. Panel from an Arch of M. Aurelius. Palazzo de' Conservatori (Vasari).

place in the *Campus Martius*, which is indicated by a personification. On the two sides is the *decursio*, which took place at the ceremony. This is rendered in the 'bird's-eye perspective', whose beginnings we noticed on Trajan's column; but with a vigour and skill that are remarkable, and stand in strong contrast to the official art of the scene of *consecratio*. Of

Panels from  
an arch of  
M. Aurelius.

one of the arches erected to commemorate the triumphs of M. Aurelius there survive eleven panels, eight in the Arch of Constantine, three in the Palazzo de' Conservatori (Fig. 86).

These panels represent a series of isolated scenes, the campaigns and triumph of the emperor. Each scene is treated as a group, and appears like the climax of an act of a drama; while each group is very well composed and is entirely self-contained, though one group leads up to another. The only noticeable clumsiness is in the panel which shows the triumphal *quadriga*; this is naturally distorted owing to the limitations of space in a tall and narrow panel. Most remarkable is the great height of the panels—over three metres—and the background above the heads of the figures, which is filled with landscape elements, trees or buildings. This

The column of  
M. Aurelius.

adds to the pictorial and 'colouristic' effect obtained by very free drilling. The column, erected after the death of

M. Aurelius, in honour of 'his exploits, is an imitation of Trajan's Column. It does not appear to be an accurate chronicle of the barbarian wars, so much as a descriptive selection of typical scenes. The efforts that have been made to give a historical interpretation to these reliefs, though brilliant and ingenious, are not convincing. The only scene that can be identified with certainty is the famous episode of the miraculous thunderstorm. Its style is of the usual pictorial character, with the deep drill-work which is not suited to relief of this kind. Though not so interesting historically as a chronicle, this column is, for this very reason perhaps, artistically better than that of Trajan, since the artists were not obliged to be faithful to detail and could draw on their imagination.

845. Of a different character are the map-like reliefs of the Arch of Septimius Seuerus (Fig. 87) commemorating his eastern

Reliefs of the  
Arch of  
Sept. Seuerus.

campaigns. These reliefs show the perspective of the bird's-eye view in its full development. This result is probably due to the attempt to render in a square field, what is better

suited to a spiral column. The only good quality of this style is that it gives a sense of space which would otherwise be absent, and that it allows the figures to stand almost free. That the group-method still survived, is shown by a relief in the Palazzo Sacchetti, which probably records the proclamation of Caracalla as *imperator destinatus*. Here

Relief of  
Caracalla.

again the rather squat figures standing free give the idea of space. The relief is, however, rather rudely executed, but

with a fine *chiaroscuro* in its drilled ornamentation. In strong contrast to this are the finely conceived and boldly rendered barbarian prisoners, who adorn the bases of the piers of the Arch of Seuerus. They show

what striking effects could be produced by a judicious use of the drill in relief.



Fig. 87. Arch of Septimius Severus (Vasari).

846. The next monument that survives is almost a hundred years later in date, the six reliefs that form the frieze of the Arch of Constantine. Four of these are possibly pre-Constantinian, since the emperor's head has been changed: but, in any case, they are not much earlier in date than the other two. These reliefs have been analysed in detail by Riegl, who has shown the 'definite artistic intention', possibly unconscious, that underlies them. They represent the triumph of the principle of space as applied to relief. The 'crystallisation' of beauty, the rendering of lines by deep drilling, and the squat solid figures, give the impression of cubical space. The scene is

Frieze of the  
Arch of  
Constantine.

not looked at against a vertical background like a drop-scene from which the objects stand out, but against a horizontal background on which the figures are placed. This subtle argument is, in the main, right. It is not relative beauty that must be considered, but the relation of the style of a period to the general evolution of art. This is not so much a technical decadence as a striving for a new field. And, through Byzantine mosaics, it is possible to trace the gradual development of art towards Italian painting.

About the same date as the Arch of Constantine is the Arch of Galerius at Salonica. Its sculptures celebrate the same Persian campaign as the Diocletianic reliefs, and resemble them in style, though traces of the 'bird's-eye perspective' still occur.

The last sculpture in this style is the base of the Obelisk of Theodosius at Constantinople. This base, which was not originally meant to support the obelisk, is probably earlier than the time of Theodosius. Its reliefs, dignified in composition and bold in execution, remind one at once of the mosaics

Arch of  
Galerius.

Base of the  
Obelisk of  
Theodosius.



Fig. 88. Perseus and Andromeda, Capitoline Museum (Vasari).



of Justinian and Theodora at Ravenna. Of the Column of Arcadius, the shattered stump may still be seen in a bye-street in Stambul; and the same is possibly the source of a much weathered fragment in the Constantinople Museum. There are also various extant drawings; but, though we can obtain some idea of the composition of the reliefs, the style of the sculpture cannot be determined.

Remains of the  
Column of  
Arcadius.

847. Closely connected with the historical reliefs in some respects are the large decorative reliefs, of which several fine examples are preserved. The best known are the eight in the Palazzo Spada and the Endymion, and the Perseus and Andromeda (Fig. 88) of the Capitol. The majority of these reliefs date from the second century A.D.: and it is remarkable that, for their types and motives, they depend on sculpture, and not on painting. The Diomed of the Spada relief is an adaptation of the statue attributed to Crēsilas: the Daedalus and Pasiphaë is totally different from the composition so familiar in Pompeian frescoes. Similarly, the Perseus in the relief before us is really a Hermes-type, connected with the Hermes of Andros. The true Perseus-type, as seen in the Hannover group and in paintings, always has the right foot raised, and always carries the *gorgoneion* and the *harpē*. The Andromeda is connected with a relief from Pergamum, and also with a type of a dancing-girl related to that of the dancing-Muse. The decorator merely took two statue-types, with which he was familiar, placed them in a romantic situation, and named them, like a Royal Academy picture. A close examination reveals that these reliefs, within their own limits, developed on much the same lines as the group-panels of historical sculpture. The fashion of decoration by pictorial reliefs lasted till the Theodosian age. The Golden Gate at Constantinople was ornamented with a series of such reliefs, which at one time were on the point of being saved by being brought to England.

Decorative  
reliefs in the  
Palazzo Spada  
and the  
Capitoline  
Museum.

Another style of relief is represented by the large number of Roman Sarcophagi still in existence. These may be broadly divided into three main groups. In the largest group, the subjects of the decoration are derived from Greek mythology. These, with Greek vases, have provided most of the illustrations for Classical Dictionaries. As a rule they depend on Greek types, and the same subject is found repeated again and again with slight alteration. The other two groups are purely Roman. One takes as its subjects the battles of Romans and barbarians. The fine third century example (Fig. 89) in the Ludovisi collection shows how the rapid play of line and high relief can reproduce all the wild confusion of battle. The third group, a very small one, describes the career of the deceased. On them is carved the record of his wars, his huntings, his marriage, his thank-offerings, and various other typical incidents of a Roman's life. It is

Reliefs on  
Sarcophagi.

for Classical

(1) Mythologi-  
cal subjects.

(2) Battle-  
scenes.



Fig. 89. Battle of Romans and barbarians. Villa Ludovisi.

worth remarking that, during the imperial period, the old Italian custom was reintroduced of representing the deceased and his wife reclining on the lid.

(3) Scenes from the life of the deceased.

848. Christian Sarcophagi naturally take different subjects, though pagan motives are often used. The earlier examples are usually decorated with the figure of the Good Shepherd, and a scroll-work of vines, amongst which are Erôtes picking grapes. The great majority of Sarcophagi, from the fourth century onwards, use purely scriptural subjects which are worked in two rows. In the centre of the upper row are usually busts of the deceased and his wife in a shell. In the sarcophagus in the Lateran here figured (Fig. 90) the busts are only blocked out, which seems to indicate that sarcophagi, finished in all but such details, were kept in stock by dealers. In the subjects here represented the *Concordantia ueteris et noui Testamenti* is observed.

Christian Sarcophagi.

The scenes are :—

The Trinity and the Creation ; Adam and Eve at the Fall ; (shell), the miracle at Cana ; the multiplication of the loaves ; the raising of Lazarus ; the Syro-Phoenician woman.

The Magi (the Epiphany) ; the healing of the blind ; Daniel among the lions fed by Habakkuk ; the denial of Peter ; the arrest of Peter ; Moses striking the rock.

The creation is here paralleled by the Epiphany ; and the raising of Lazarus and the episode of the Syro-Phoenician woman find their Old Testament analogy in Moses striking the rock. Some of these sarcophagi, such as that of Iunius Bassus (d. 350 A.D.), now in the crypt of St Peter's, have an architectural background, which adds greatly to the effect of the 'space-composition', noticeable also here. Further, there is a class of sarcophagi, distinguished from the rest by an architectural background richly decorated by means of deep drill-work. Some of this class are Christian, some are pagan ; and, since several have been found in Asia Minor, the whole class has been claimed as Anatolian. Of Christian sculpture in the round, there are few examples. There is a statue of Hippolytus in the Lateran. The head, however, is restored, and the statue is an ordinary example of a seated figure. More interesting are the statuettes of the Good Shepherd in the Lateran, and the Capitol, and in the Museums at Athens, Sparta, and Constantinople. These, which are of the third century, show the pictorial style of the time. The motive is in origin Greek, and can be derived from the type of Hermes Moschôphôrus, or Criôphôrus. Probably the scarcity of Christian Sculpture is due to Judaic tradition, and to the desire to keep the Gentile proselytes away from graven images. The famous

Seated statue of Hippolytus.

Statuettes in the Museums of the Good Shepherd.

Statue of St Peter.






Fig. 90. Christian Sarcophagus. Lateran Museum (Vasari).



statue of St Peter in the crypt of St Peter's at Rome is now usually thought to be Christian, and not an adaptation of a pagan statue.

849. Here our brief sketch of Roman Sculpture, as far as the end of the fourth century, must end. In conclusion, attention must be drawn to the fact that purely ornamental work illustrates the same general principles of development. In the Augustan age the cuirass of the 'Prima Porta' Augustus, the stuccoes of the Farnesina, and the *Ara Pacis*, show that Greek skill was independent of material. Marble, metal and stucco were all the same to the trained craftsman. Some fine fragments in the Lateran show us that ornament also passed through Flavian Naturalism and Hadrianic Hellenism to the 'colouristic' style of the Antonines. Thence the transition to the solidity of later art is easy; and in the period between Constantine and Arcadius Roman art merges into Byzantine.

Parallel  
development  
of purely  
ornamental  
work.

Pliny. *Historia Naturalis*, *The elder Pliny's chapters on the History of Art*, ed. Jex-Blake and Sellers, London, 1896.—Altmann, W. *Architectur und Ornamentik der antiken Sarkophage*, Berlin, 1902.—*Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit*, Berlin, 1905.—Bernoulli, J. J. *Römische Ikonographie*, Stuttgart, Berlin and Leipzig, 1882—1894.—Bienkowski, P. *Historia kształtów biustu sta- rożytnego*, Cracow, 1895; cp. *Anzeiger der Akad. der Wissenschaften in Krakau*, 1894, p. 285, and *Rev. Arch.*, 1895, ii p. 293 ff.—Courbaud, E. *Le Bas-relief romain à représentations historiques*, Paris, 1899.—Crowfoot, J. W. *Some Portraits of the Flavian Age*, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1900, p. 31 ff.—Lady Evans. *Hairdressing of Roman Ladies as illustrated on coins*, *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1906, p. 37 ff, plates III—VI.—Hekler, A. *Römische Weibliche Gewandstatuen in Münchener Arch. Studien*, Munich, 1909.—Kaufmann, C. H. *Handbuch der Christlichen Arch.*, Paderborn, 1905.—Kraus, F. X. *Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst*, Freiburg, 1896.—Lowrie, W. *Christian Art and Archaeology*, London and New York, 1901.—Michon, E. *Les Bas Reliefs Hist. Romains au Musée du Louvre* (Monuments Piot, vol. xvii), Paris, 1910.—Petersen, E. *Ara Pacis Augustae*, Vienna, 1902.—Philippi, A. *Ueber die römischen Triumphalreliefe und ihre Stellung in die Kunstgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1872.—Riegl, A. *Die spätromische Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Oesterreich-Ungarn*, Vienna, 1901.—Robert, C. *Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs*, Berlin, 1890 (in progress).—Strong, Mrs Arthur. *Roman Sculpture*, London, 1907.—Stuart Jones, H. *Art under the Roman Empire*, *Quarterly Review*, No. 406, London, 1906, and *Roman Art (b) Sculpture*, in *Enc. Brit.* xxiii 477—480.—Strzygowski, J. *Orient oder Rom*, Leipzig, 1901.—Id. *Mschatta*, *Jahrb. der königl. preussischen Kunstsammlungen*, Berlin, 1904.—Studniczka, F. *Tropaeum Traiani*, Leipzig, 1904, and *Zur Ara Pacis*, 1909.—Venturi, A. *Storia dell' arte italiana*, i, Milan, 1901.—Wace, A. J. B. *The Evolution of Art in Roman Portraiture*, *Journal of the Brit. and Amer. Arch. Society of Rome*, vol. iii, No. 8, Rome, 1906.—Walters, H. B. *The Art of the Romans*, London, 1912.—Wickhoff, F. *Roman Art*, London, 1900.

Bibliography.  
Works of  
General  
Reference.

See also Espérandieu, *Recueil général des bas-reliefs de la Gaule romaine*, 1907; and S. Reinach, *Répertoire de reliefs grecs et romains*, 1909.

For the architectural terracottas from Luna, see Amelung, *Führer durch die Antiken in Florenz*, p. 180, and, for those in the Palazzo de'

Conservatori in Rome, Helbig, *Führer*<sup>2</sup>, i p. 419. For an account of the 'Arringatore', see Amelung, *op. cit.* p. 257. For Tufa Sculptures in Rome and at Pompeii, see Helbig, *op. cit.* i pp. 488, 491, and Mau-Kelsey, Pompeii<sup>2</sup>, p. 349, fig. 178. The inscriptions of the artists of Aphrodisias have been published by Loewy, *Inscriften gr. Bildhauer*, No. 364 f, and by Visconti, *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma*, 1886, p. 317 f. The bronze statue of Septimius Seuerus at Brussels is well reproduced by Furtwängler, *Collection Somsze*, Plates XXX, XXXI. For the extant representation of Roman pediments, see Brunn, *Kleine Schriften*, i p. 103, Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités, Capitoliun*, Petersen, *Röm. Mitt.*, 1895, pl. v, Id. *Ara Pacis Augustae*, pp. 63, 67, Hartwig, *Röm. Mitt.*, 1904, pl. IV. Amelung, *Röm. Mitt.*, 1908, p. 1 ff. The Arch of Augustus at Susa is described by Studniczka, *Jahrbuch d. kaisert. deutsch. arch. Instituts*, 1903, p. 1 ff. The fragments attributed to the arch of Claudius, the Domitianic medallions of the arch of Constantine, and the panels from an arch of M. Aurelius, are discussed by Stuart-Jones in Vol. iii of the *Papers of the British School at Rome*, p. 215 f, Sieveking, *Röm. Mitt.*, 1907, pp. 345 f, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1911, pp. 1239 f, Reinach, *Rev. Arch.* 1910, xv pp. 118 f, and M. Bieber, *Röm. Mitt.*, 1911, pp. 214 f. The reliefs of the columns of Trajan and M. Aurelius are published by Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Traianssäule*, and by Domaszewski-Petersen, *Die Marcussäule*. For the Hadrianic panels in the Palazzo de' Conservatori, see *Papers of Brit. School at Rome*, iv pp. 258 ff. For the base of the column of Antoninus, see Amelung, *Skulpturen d. Vatican. Museums*, i pl. 116, 117. For late reliefs of the age of Septimius Seuerus and Constantine, and the base of the obelisk of Theodosius, see *Papers of Brit. School at Rome*, iv pp. 263 ff; and *Journ. Hellenic Studies*, 1909, 60—69. For the arch of Galerius at Salonica see Kinch, *L'Arc de triomphe de Salonique*. For the column of Arcadius, see Strzygowski, *Jahrbuch d. kaisert. deutsch. arch. Instituts*, 1893, p. 230, and Geffroy, *Monuments Piot*, Vol. ii p. 99. For the 'Hellenistic' reliefs, and the Golden Gate at Constantinople, see Schreiber, *Die Wiener Brunnenreliefs aus Palazzo Grimani*, and *Die hellenistischen Reliefbilder und die Augusteische Kunst* (*Jahrbuch d. kaisert. deutsch. arch. Instituts*, 1896, p. 78 ff), Sieveking in Brunn-Bruckmann's *Denkmäler*, No. 621 f; Wace, *Papers of Brit. School at Rome*, v, pp. 167 f, and also Strzygowski, *Jahrbuch d. kaisert. deutsch. arch. Instituts*, 1893, pp. 21, 29 seqq. For the 'Anatolian' Sarcophagi, and the statuettes of the 'Good Shepherd', see Muñoz, *Nuovo Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, 1905, p. 79 ff, De Rossi, *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma*, 1889, p. 131 ff, and Strzygowski, *Journ. Hellenic Studies*, 1907, p. 99 ff; also Mendel, *Bulletin de Corr. Hellénique*, 1909, pp. 333 ff.

### VII. 3. ETRUSCAN AND ITALIAN TERRACOTTAS.

850. THE productions in terracotta (baked clay), which are especially connected with the artistic fame of Greece, were the statuettes of dainty design and execution, found in numbers at Tanagra, and on other Hellenic sites. Similar statuettes have also been found in Italy, but they were mainly produced by Greeks, or under Greek influence, and the reader is referred to the *Companion to Greek Studies* (§ 300) for some account of their intention and manufacture.

Greek use of  
terracotta  
for statuettes.

851. On the other hand, the use of terracotta for larger statues and for architectural purposes, though practised occasionally by the Greeks, may be regarded as preeminently an Italian art. That this was also the view of antiquity we know on the authority of Varro, recorded for us by Pliny (xxxv 157). As regards sculpture, it is known from literary sources that the most venerable images of the gods of Rome were made of clay. The statue of the Capitoline Jove, which had been made by an artist called Vulca (?) summoned by Tarquin from Veii, was made of clay and coloured with vermilion (*ibid.*). To renew the colouring (a process called by Plutarch, *Q. R.* xviii, γάρωσις) was one of the first duties of the newly appointed censors. Moralists in Imperial times expressed a sentimental preference for such 'innocent' materials. In the time of Pliny many such early works of sculpture survived. To-day the best idea of the early fictile sculptures (apart from architecture) can be obtained from the Etruscan cinerary urns, and sepulchral masks; and from the recumbent groups on the Etruscan sarcophagi. (Compare the remarkable sarcophagus from Cervetri in the British Museum.) Such recumbent figures were, so far as we can ascertain, unknown to the Greeks. They first occur on the Etruscan tombs, and thence by direct descent on the sarcophagi of the Roman Empire.

Italian use of  
terracotta for  
larger statues.

852. The most famous example of terracotta applied to architecture was the Capitoline temple begun by Tarquin, and dedicated by Horatius, after the expulsion of the kings. Its sculptural decorations in terracotta, consisting of chariot-groups on the pediment, were the work of the Etruscan artist Vulca already mentioned (§ 851) as the author of the temple-image. It is related by Plutarch that a chariot-group for this pediment was incomplete at the time of the expulsion of Tarquin. Contrary to the ordinary course of events, the group swelled instead of shrinking in the furnace, and the Veientes refused to deliver so remarkable a work to Rome until warned by a portent of unmistakeable significance (Plut. *Poplicola*, c. 13; Plin. xxviii 16).

Terracotta  
applied to  
architecture.

853. Another famous Roman building with decorations of terracotta was the temple of Ceres, vowed by A. Postumius, before the battle of Lake Regillus. It was decorated by the artists Dāmophilus and Gorgāsus, who were at once 'plastae' and painters. They decorated the temple with both their arts, and inscribed a Greek epigram, recording their respective shares in the work (Plin. xxxv 154).

854. In its essence, however, though Greek artists thus found employment at Rome, the art of protecting wooden buildings with terracotta facings and decorations was probably of Etruscan origin. It is true that, on certain Greek sites, we find terracotta applied to mask buildings of stone (*e.g.* on the Geloan Treasury at Olympia, and on one of the temples at Sēlinūs), but it has been conjectured with probability that this unnecessary and therefore unnatural application of terracotta to stone was an adaptation of the more natural use of terracotta on wood, as practised in Italy, and

especially by the Etruscans. The best idea of the style, in its Italian form, can be obtained from the partial reconstructions that have been recently attempted, of buildings whose remains have been found at Falerii, Cervetri, and Lanuvium. Fragments from the two last named sites may be seen in the British Museum. In addition to plain panels covering the surfaces of timber with palmettes and other designs, we find a wealth of antefixal ornaments masking the lower ends of the covering tiles of the roof. It is true that tradition assigned the invention of such decorations to the Greek potter, Butades of Sicyon (Plin. xxxv 151). But in Greece they were for the most part executed in marble, though terracotta examples also occur. In Italy they long continued to be made of terracotta. As an indication of changing fashion, it may be mentioned that Cato found reason to complain in 195 B.C. that the clay antefixes of the Roman temples were regarded as objects of ridicule by those who praised the fashions of Athens and Corinth (Liv. xxxiv 4, 4).

855. The practice of mural decoration in terracotta persisted in Italy. Towards the close of the Roman republic, terracotta panels with decorative designs in relief became common. These panels (sometimes known as 'Campana reliefs' on account of the richness of the Campana collection in this class of work) were principally designed to be used as an internal lining. They are stated to have been found serving as a continuous frieze in a building. For the most part, they have nail-holes, by means of which they could be fixed to their wooden backgrounds, but examples have also been found set in the stucco wall-surface. In many cases they are finished at the lower edges and at the back in a way that shows that they were used as *antepagmenta* masking architrave beams and hanging below them. Other reliefs of the same period are arranged to form a *sima* or guttering, crowning the cornice of a building, and pierced at intervals by gargoyles of various forms.

856. The moulds for the terracotta reliefs appear to have been sent from hand to hand among connoisseurs. Thus Cicero writes to Atticus (*Ep. ad Att.* i 10) that he commissions him to obtain moulds for reliefs (*typos*) to be set in the stucco of the little atrium of the Tusculan villa. Atticus was asked to send these moulds from Athens, but we have evidence from inscriptions proving the Roman origin of many examples. Terracotta panels are supposed to have gone out of fashion at the beginning of the Empire; they are hardly found at Pompeii. The saying attributed to Augustus by Suetonius (*Aug.* 28), that he found Rome built of bricks, and left it of marble, appears to represent a literal fact in this branch of art.

857. The terracotta panels described in the previous sections merely served to mask the main structure of the building. Towards the close of the first century of our era, bricks were moulded in decorative forms, according to the member of the order in which they were to be employed. The principal examples are the capitals and cornices of the so-called 'Temple of Deus Rēdicūlus'

Moulded  
bricks.



(which was in fact a tomb), and of the Amphitheatrum Castrense, in Rome. The extant examples of this method are not numerous.

858 (a). The Romans were also preeminent as builders in brick, and tiles, the latter being used as facings to a concrete core, and themselves covered with stucco. Such tiles are usually stamped with a device stating the name of the pottery, the name of the estate from which the clay was derived, and the date marked by the name of Consuls or Emperor. (See Fig. 157 on p. 154 of the *British Museum Guide to the Exhibition illustrating Greek and Roman Life*.)

858 (b). The terracotta pottery is of characteristic shapes and fabrics. It is often richly adorned with reliefs, but a pictorial decoration, similar to that of Greek painted vases, hardly occurs. The art had died out in the 3rd century B.C.

Bormann, *Die Keramik in der Baukunst* (1897), in Durm's *Handbuch der Architektur*, Part I, iv pp. 28—52; Wiegand in *La Glyptothèque Ny-Carlsberg*, ii 3—32; Walters, *Catalogue of the Terracottas* (1903), and of the *Roman Pottery* (1908), in the *British Museum*; Deonna, *Les statues de terre cuite dans l'antiquité*, 1908; Déchelette, *Vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule Romaine*, 1904.

Bibliography.

#### VII. 4. ENGRAVED GEMS.

859. ALL races ascribe magical power to crystalline and other stones of striking form or colour, and employ them as potent amulets.

In fact jewellery, like all ornament, has its origin in Magic rather than in Aesthetic. The objects used as jewellery all over the world at present amongst primitive peoples have invariably such an origin, whilst even down to modern times precious stones, e.g. the opal, have been regarded as magical and are viewed with superstition even amongst ourselves. In order to enhance the magical property inherent in the stone, some races began to cut on it sacred symbols, a practice which first arose in Babylonia and Egypt. The Babylonians used stones in the form of cylinders, at first plain, but afterwards engraved with a sacred subject (Fig. 91) to augment the natural potency of

Use of  
precious  
stones.




Fig. 91. Impression from an early Babylonian cylinder; with the name of the owner and his deity, between two representations (reversed) of the same subject: *real size*. British Museum. From J. H. Middleton's *Lewis Gems*, p. 14.

the stone. In Egypt also the cylinder was the earliest form, but it was soon superseded by stones cut in the form of the sacred beetle—the scarabaeus. In the course of time such engraved amulets were found convenient for stamping clay or wax, in order to secure property against theft. There is no mention of engraved gems in Homer, although there are many passages in which we might expect to find the signet used, if it had been employed by the Achaeans, as, *e.g.*, the letter of Proetus to the king of Lycia, the opening and closing of treasure-chambers and coffers. Yet engraved gems (see *Companion to Greek Studies*) were in use in the Bronze Age of Greece. (Fig. 92.)



Fig. 92. Example of a lenticular gem of heraldic type, in rock crystal: *real size*. British Museum, no. 57.

These early lenticular and glandular gems are usually of soft materials, such as steatite and slate, although the engraver had mastered hard stones. They are commonly glandular or bean-shaped and pierced for suspension, the designs being generally naturalistic. They were suspended from the neck or wrist and were primarily worn as amulets, for which they are still used in Melos and Crete. The lenticular and glandular gems were succeeded by those shaped like scarabs or scaraboids, pierced for suspension. (Figs. 93, 94.) It is on these that appear the best productions of the Greek engraver. On these are found heroic subjects corresponding




Fig. 93. Greek scarab of the sixth century B.C. of the finest archaic style: *one and a half times the real size*. British Museum, no. 289.



Fig. 94. Greek scarab-gem of the best period of Art: *one and a half times the real size*. Middleton's *Lewis Gems*, p. 28.

in design and treatment to the sculpture of the same period. Portraiture on gems first appears in 5th cent. B.C.

The scarab and scaraboid continued in Greece till the 4th cent. B.C., the latter being often of large size, and worn suspended. From this time the practice of setting stones in rings became universal, and this entailed a modification of form; the convex side of the scaraboid was more and more flattened, leaving the engraved face flat, the back slightly convex, a type which survived into Roman times. But in order to adapt it to rings the Romans often engraved the convex side, and inserted the flat in the ring. Afterwards, from the time of Alexander, the flat slices of stones, which were still better adapted for setting, came into use.

860. Though precious stones had been prized as amulets in Italy from the earliest times, the practice of engraving gems was adventitious. Gems of the Mycenaean type have not unfrequently been found in Italy, whilst it was in the Greek cities of Magna Graecia and Sicily that the engraver's art reached its zenith in coin dies and in gems.

Engraved  
gems in Italy.

861. In Etruria there were Greek colonies—Caere, Pisa, Falerii, etc.—all planted before the coming of the Tyrrheni from Lydia. It is to these settlers from Greece as well as to the later immigrants from that country, *e.g.* Eugrammus, etc., that the arts of Etruria are to be ascribed. Very many engraved gems, often of great merit, have been found in Etruscan tombs, ranging from the 7th to the 3rd cent. B.C. These gems are almost invariably scarabs, and though at first sight they may be thought to have come direct from Egypt through the Phoenicians, they must be rather held to be Greek. The designs and work in the great majority of cases are Greek. But they were not imported from Athens or Greece, as often supposed, being rather the products of the Greek colonists of Etruria, whose artistic skill was famous. The subjects are usually Greek heroes, rarely gods, the names of the persons being often in Etruscan script. The figures have long bodies and short legs, as in archaic Greek sculpture. These scarabs were not used merely as signets, but more frequently had an amuletic and decorative function. The material is usually sard, and these scarabs are found in the tombs in rows to serve as necklaces, or as pendants and earrings. True Etruscan devices are very rare.

Etruscan  
gems.

862. The Romans derived their gem-engraving, like all their other arts, from the Greeks of Etruria, and South Italy. From first to last the best Roman gems were always the work of Greeks, as was certainly the case in the early Empire (cp. § 865 *infra*). Yet there are many gems, which are the undoubted work of native artists, whose style was distinct from that of the contemporary Greeks. The best specimen of Roman Republican engraving is the gem found (1780) in a sarcophagus on the skeleton hand of L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus (Cons. B.C. 298). It is a sard engraved in a dry, wiry fashion with a standing Victory, winged

Roman gems.

and holding a palm-branch, a subject found on many Roman gems, e.g. No. 31, Fitzwilliam Mus. Coll. (Fig. 95). The common types at this period are Jupiter (*ib.* No. 27, Fig. 96), Juno, Minerva, Castor and Pollux



Fig. 95. Roman gem; Victory.



Fig. 96. Roman gem; Jupiter.

(§ 704) and other deities; Roma enthroned is also common, being adapted from a Greek Athene (cp. Coins of Lysimachus). The deities have Greek dress, Iuno Sospita of Lanuvium with her goat-skin and serpent being a rare exception of a deity in native dress.

863. The Latin names for the signet ring demonstrate Greek influence, if not origin. (1) In old Latin the Gk δακτύλιος was termed *ungulus* (Varro and Pliny), probably a translation of ὄνυχιον = *onyx*, a favourite stone for seals at Athens in 5th cent. B.C. (cf. *Ar. Nub.* 332: σφραγιδονυχαραγοκομήτης). (2) *Symbolum* (properly the *device*) = σύμβολον. (3) *Condalium* is probably from Gk κόνδυλος. On the other hand *ānulus* seems the true Latin word for a ring, and was probably the term applied to the old Roman ring of iron without any gem, which continued down to Imperial times to be used in betrothal. And this probably had its origin in the magical properties ascribed to iron, especially magnetic iron. In early times rings of any kind were little worn at Rome (Pliny, *N. H.* xxxiii 8 ff). Amongst the statues of the kings only those of Numa and Servius had rings. The ordinary Romans only wore iron rings. The *ius anuli aurei* was at first only granted to an ambassador when representing the State abroad, but on his return he had to surrender his gold ring, and resume his iron. Senators and consuls next were allowed gold rings, and finally they became the badge of the Equestrian order (cp. the *modius* of gold rings sent to Carthage by Hannibal after the battle of Cannae, *Liv.* xxiii 12). Under the later Empire a freeman wore a gold ring, a freedman silver, a slave iron, though the latter were sometimes plated with gold (specimens of which survive).

864. At Rome the seal (*sigillum*) played an important part from the Republic onwards in legal documents. With the Greeks it was simply used to secure a letter or a will from curiosity or fraud, but with the Romans the seal was an essential part of the authentication of the document itself, both principals and witnesses having to affix their seals at the head of the document. The use of seals

The signet  
ring.

The use of  
seals.



in our own legal instruments is derived from the Roman practice. Thus Augustus himself authenticated his edicts with his signet, his first bearing a sphinx, his second a head of Alexander engraved by Pyrgotēles, and his third his own head engraved by Dioscōrides (Suet. *Aug.* 50). This last was used by all subsequent emperors down to Pliny's day (A.D. 79), except Galba (A.D. 68), who used his family device—a dog on a ship's prow (Dio Cass. li 3). Maecenas used a frog, a device much dreaded, as it was associated with fresh taxes. This badge of one descended from Etruscan kings has also been found on scarabs in Etruscan tombs. Sulla used a signet engraved with the surrender of Iugurtha, and another with three trophies in allusion to his three great victories (see also § 703 *supra*), Pompey likewise used three trophies on his ring which Caesar showed to the Senate to convince them of his rival's defeat and death. Pompey also used a lion holding a sword.

865. Under the Empire gems with a great variety of devices and cut on all sorts of stones—sard, chalcedony, jasper, lapis lazuli, agate, onyx, sardonyx, beryl, emerald, crystal, amethyst, carbuncle—were very common. The Graeco-Roman gems can hardly be called Roman, for in design as well as in technique they are essentially Greek. But there are two classes of engraved stones mainly characteristic of (though not exclusively confined to) Rome—portraits in intaglio and cameos.

866. The finest class of Roman gems are the portrait heads of emperors (Figs. 97, 98, 99) or members of the emperor's family, or those



Fig. 97. Profile portrait of Nero and Poppaea: one and a half times full size. *Lewis Gems*, p. 65.



Fig. 98. Profile portrait of the Empress Domitia: one and a half times full size. *Lewis Gems*, p. 86.



Fig. 99. Laureated portrait of Caracalla: one and a half times full size. *Lewis Gems*, p. 66.

of private individuals who owned the gems, the last being a very numerous class. These portrait gems were probably the work of Greeks, *e.g.* Dioscōrides, who engraved the head of Augustus, and Euōdos, who engraved that of Iulia.

The finest gems are those engraved under Augustus, those of the Flavian period as a whole not being quite so fine, but under Hadrian the art of engraving, like the other arts, again rose to a high degree of excellence.

867. Amongst the most common subjects are single figures of various deified abstractions, *e.g.* Salus, Fortuna, Abundantia, Indulgentia, Felicitas, Bonus Eventus, etc., which are exactly of the same form as those on the contemporary silver and gold coins, whilst Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Roma, etc., are just as common on both gems and coins.

868. The Graeco-Egyptian painter Antiphilus painted a grotesque figure called the *Gryllus*, 'grasshopper'. Hence (says Pliny) this name was given to comic pictures (Pliny, *N. H.* xxxv 114). Such pictures were popular and became favourite and were copied frequently for gems (cp. Fitzwilliam Cat. No. 90).

869. In the 1st cent. A.D. gems engraved with Harpocrates or Horus, Isis, Serāpis, and other Egyptian gods came into fashion at Rome (Pliny, *N. H.* xxxiii 41).

870. Gems with Mithraic devices, as well as those bearing the *Abraxas* of Basilides the Gnostic (Fig. 100), were especially common from the 2nd cent. A.D. These were regarded as powerful talismans, a green jasper with an *Abraxas* being especially potent in certain diseases (Galen). Gems engraved with a lucky horoscope were very largely used under the Empire, when superstition of all kinds was very rife.



Fig. 100. The Abraxas deity: real size. *Lewis Gems*, p. 78.

871. Gems cut in relief were not unknown to the Greeks even in the 6th cent. B.C., but they were cut out of monochrome stones. This class however (*ectypae*, Pliny, *N. H.* xxxvii 173) is especially characteristic of the Roman Empire. They were almost always cut out of stratified stones, *e.g.* onyx or sardonyx, the latter being very

fashionable, as it had been already for signets since the time of the elder Scipio Africanus, who was the first Roman to use a signet of this stone (Juv. vi 382; vii 144; xii 139; Pers. i 16; Mart. iv 28, 4; iv 61, 6). The design was cut out of one stratum, another forming the background. Most characteristic are large heads of Medusa, used to adorn the cuirass or the brooch of the *paludamentum* of the emperor. Some very large historical cameos survive, e.g. Coronation of Augustus, Apotheosis of Augustus, head of Augustus (Fig. 101), Apotheosis of Germanicus, etc.



Fig. 101. Head of Augustus, in sardonyx (chaplet added in mediaeval times).  
From the frontispiece of the British Museum Catalogue of Gems.

But cameo portraits of private persons are also not unknown. For instance, the interesting portrait of a youth cut in sardonyx (Fig. 102), probably of the first century A.D.



Fig. 102. Portrait of youth, in sardonyx, probably first cent. A.D.  
In Prof. Ridgeway's possession.

872. Though the Greeks valued gems not only as amulets, but also as works of art from at least the time of Alexander, and gave large prices for fine specimens (Theophrastus), yet it was amongst the Romans in the later Republic and the early Empire that the passion for gem-collecting, like that of buying other costly works of art, rose to its highest pitch, and many great collections were either brought to, or formed at, Rome, the contents being the works of Greek, and not of Roman artists. The first collection of gems at Rome was that of Mithridates the Great, captured and dedicated by Pompey in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus. It was this collection, says Pliny, which created a taste for gem-collecting at Rome. Mithridates had not formed his collection merely as a connoisseur, but rather had amassed a powerful series of charms as antidotes against poison, and as amulets against harm. Thus it was the practical and not the aesthetic aspect which especially appealed to him, and certainly not their use as signets merely. The first gem-collector at Rome was M. Aem. Scaurus, Sulla's stepson, and the conqueror of Arëtas, the Nabatean king (B.C. 62 or 60) (see § 704 *supra*). Iulius Caesar also presented a collection of gems to the temple of Venus Genitrix, which he built in his new Forum (Pliny), whilst he was always ready to give a high price for gems which claimed to be the work of any famous old Greek engraver (Pliny, xxxvii 11).

Augustus dedicated in the temple of Concord (*ib.* xxxvii 4, 8) a gold horn containing a sardonyx said to be the original gem cast into the sea by Polycrates of Samos to avert Nemesis, but Herodotus (iii 39) says that



this stone was an emerald. Clement of Alexandria says that its device was a lyre, whilst Pliny says that the sardonix dedicated by Augustus was plain (*intacta inlibataque est*). Marcellus, the nephew of Augustus, dedicated another collection of gems in the temple of Apollo (Pliny, *N. H.* xxxvii 11). Hadrian had formed a large collection of gems, which were sold by Marcus Aurelius along with other works of art by public auction to pay the expenses of the war against the Marcomanni. From an inscription it appears that the Imperial gem cabinet was in charge of a special freedman (*a dactylitheca Caesaris*). Iulius Caesar had a *custos anuli*, and probably his successors had a similar official, from which office our Keepers of the Great Seal and Privy Seal may be ultimately derived.

J. H. Middleton, *Engraved Gems of Classical Times* (1891); Furtwängler, *Die antiken Gemmen* (1900); C. W. King, *Antique Gems* (1866); *id.* *Precious Stones and Metals* (1865 and 1883); *id.* *Handbook of Engraved Gems* (1885), *Antique Gems and Rings* (1872), *The Gnostics and their Remains* (2nd ed. 1887); A. S. Murray and A. H. Smith, *Brit. Museum Cat. of Gems* (1888); Babelon, *La gravure en pierres fines* (1894); S. Reinach, *Pierres gravées* (1895); Furtwängler, *Beschreibung der geschnittenen Steine im Antiquarium*, Berlin (1896). Bibliography.

## VII. 5. ROMAN PAINTING.

873. THAT the art of painting was known and practised in Rome even in early times, we learn from scattered references in ancient writers, but, until the last century of the Republic, the centres of Italian art lay, not in Rome itself, but in Magna Graecia and Etruria. In both of these painting had flourished from an early period, and it will be convenient to notice their art here before approaching the history of Roman painting.

874. Of painting in Magna Graecia we know only that it was akin to that of Greece proper. From references in Pliny and Cicero it appears that, of the great Greek masters, Zeuxis, at least, was employed in Italy, and it is even possible that he was a native of the Italian Heraclea. But we have no evidence that the Greek colonies in S. Italy ever developed an independent school, and of their works in painting no trace survives except in the vases of the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C., which have been discovered in such abundance in Campania and Apulia. These differ not a little from the red-figured vases of Greece proper. The technique indeed is similar, except that touches of white, yellow, and purple are freely employed to relieve the simple red; but the style of drawing is looser and more hasty, the ornamentation more florid and crowded, and, in certain classes, floral devices predominate over figures. Again, the painter's aim is different. Not only does the use of additional colours show a desire to rival the richness of independent painting, but there is an evident, though faint, attempt to suggest light and shade and modelling by means of hatching, and, perhaps also, by the patches of colour

Magna  
Graecia.

before mentioned. Moreover, the difference in the drawing is, probably, not merely due to haste or incompetence, but in part at least reflects the broader and more pictorial style of contemporary painting. This, like modern painting, was seeking effects of light and colour, and, accordingly, avoided rather than desired the precise outlines of earlier art, which had relied for its charm on beauty of form and purity of drawing. Whether this predilection for a broader style was in any way peculiar to Italy, we cannot tell; but it is certain that the same tendencies which the vases suggest, are clearly visible in the Italian paintings of Roman times at Pompeii and elsewhere. And it is perhaps not an accident that these latter, and especially such as are most purely Italian, show also that fondness for a soft and voluptuous type of human figure which is discernible in the S. Italian vases.

875. Our knowledge of Etruscan painting is greater, for wall-paintings of considerable extent and well preserved have been found  
 Etruria. in tombs at Corneto, Chiusi, Vulci and elsewhere. Most of these show clear traces of Greek influence, though the types and subjects are native. They cannot be dated with accuracy, but were probably executed in the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. Those at Corneto, facsimiles of which can be seen at the British Museum, are typical of all. They fall into two series (one considerably later in date than the other), and differ greatly in style. The first series, which contains scenes from daily life, games, and representations of religious ceremonies, is executed in few colours (brown, dull red, green, white, and black) upon a dull yellow ground. The colour is laid on in flat masses and there is little attempt to indicate either the folds of the drapery or the anatomy of the figure. In general style, they recall Greek vases of the 6th century, but the drawing is clumsy in comparison, and the heads are of an Etruscan, not of a Greek, type; rudely portrait-like and not idealised. In the second series, which likewise presents scenes from daily life, there is a marked advance. The figures are painted in light colours on a dark-brown ground; the drawing is less clumsy and more correct, sometimes almost graceful. In the drapery of the women, the folds are carefully and not ungracefully indicated by numerous fine lines, as on Attic vases of the early 5th century. The details of the figure are indicated in a similar way, and the drawing of the heads is more correct and natural, especially in the treatment of the eyes and mouth. Moreover, the heads are idealised to a degree unusual in Etruscan art. In all these points, this second series illustrates remarkably the innovations ascribed by Pliny (xxxv 58) to the Greek painter Polygnôtus (c. 475 B.C.), though the paintings themselves are of a far later date,—a singular proof of the conservatism of Etruscan art. And, though inferior in workmanship to the best Greek vase-paintings, they are the nearest representatives we now possess of early Greek painting on a large scale, and are an indubitable proof of the strength of Greek influence on Etruscan art at this period. In other respects, in the choice of subject, the

defective knowledge of the figure, the portrait-like character of the heads, and the general tendency to realism, these works show the characteristics of Etruscan art at all periods, characteristics which reappear later in Roman art.

876. During this early period painting was doubtless employed at Rome, as elsewhere, for the decoration of temples, but, like the other arts, it was probably little regarded, and it may safely be assumed that the artists employed were usually either Greeks or Etruscans. We are, indeed, informed that one Roman of good family, C. Fabius, surnamed Pictor, practised this art and decorated the Temple of Salus with paintings in the year 304 B.C., and pictures are likewise ascribed to the poet Pacuvius (Plin. xxxv 19), but such cases were isolated and exceptional. As early as the 3rd century, however, a characteristic form of painting begins to appear. In the year 263 M. Valerius Messala exhibited in the Curia Hostilia a picture illustrating his victory over the Carthaginians and Hiero, and similar works were afterwards exhibited by L. Scipio Aemilianus and other victorious generals, who displayed at their triumphs pictures illustrating the events of their campaigns and the cities and countries where they had taken place (*ib.* 22). We even hear that, after the fall of Carthage in 146, L. Hostilius Mancinus, though not a general, exhibited a picture of the siege in the forum, and himself explained it to the crowd; a piece of affability which, as Pliny tells us, gained him the consulship in the ensuing year (*ib.* 23). Whatever the artistic value of such works may have been, they are important as precursors of that specially Roman form of art, which culminates in the Column of Trajan. The realistic representation of historical events and definite localities was rare in Greek art, even of the Hellenistic period; but we shall presently notice in Roman painting, if not instances of these topographical pictures themselves, at least reflexions of the spirit which generated them. Pictures of gladiatorial combats, which appear to have been not uncommon, illustrate the same tendency.

877. In the last century of the Republic and under the Empire, painting, like the other arts, was more generally practised in Rome, and its range now included subjects of all classes. The names of several artists are preserved, some of Roman, others of Greek origin, but the records are so slight that only one of these need here be mentioned, a certain Ludius (or possibly S. Tadius, for the MSS are corrupt), who painted decorative landscapes in the time of Augustus. According to Pliny (*ib.* 116) he introduced 'a very pleasing style of wall-painting', representing in his pictures, 'villas, porticoes, landscape gardens, sacred groves, woods, hills, fish-ponds, straits, rivers, shores etc.'; enlivened by figures of all kinds engaged in various ways, some of them having a humorous tendency. Pliny's statement that Ludius was the first to employ such subjects for the decoration of walls cannot be reconciled with Vitruvius (vii 5), by whom subjects almost identical are ascribed to the *antiqui*, a term by which he

probably designates the Hellenistic Greeks. We must therefore assume, either that Ludius was the first to popularise such subjects at Rome, or that his originality lay in some novelty of treatment, the nature of which cannot now be determined. But the words of both authors prove the popularity of decorative landscape at this period, and still more conclusive evidence is furnished by the existing wall-paintings, to which we now turn.

878. Wall-paintings almost innumerable have been discovered in Pompeii and Herculaneum, and not a few in Rome and its environs. Multifarious in subject, they suffice to give some idea of nearly every branch of the art as then practised.

Existing  
paintings.

But, for obvious reasons, they do not fully represent the capacity of Roman painting. In the first place, they are wall-paintings, and therefore decorative in purpose. The colouring is intended to harmonise with the general scheme of decoration, and to this end truth to nature is often sacrificed. Moreover, as the rooms decorated were often ill-lighted, a bright and vivid colouring was naturally preferred, and shade was commonly reduced to the minimum required for modelling. Secondly, all or nearly all these paintings are frescoes, or frescoes retouched *a secco*, and the rapidity required by this method of painting precludes elaborate refinements of execution. And, thirdly, the artists employed in such works were naturally not of the first rank, although, as might be expected, there were marked differences in this respect. The paintings in Rome and its neighbourhood are in general superior to those elsewhere. Nevertheless, the average level throughout is high. The best paintings are evidently the work of accomplished artists, and all, except a few rude sketches in the poorer houses, show a technical dexterity astonishing in works of this class.

879. The subjects include mythology, landscape, *Genre* and still-life, with others intermediate between these classes. The mythological subjects are, in most cases, taken from the cycle of legends popular in Alexandrine times; in a few cases only, from Greek epic or drama. Many of the more popular, such as the 'Deserted Ariadne', 'Andromeda', 'Narcissus', 'Io', 'Europa', occur, again and again, with slight variations, and evidently reproduce some popular original. In most cases the figures are set in a landscape back-ground. This is frequently slight, and even when considerable, is usually subordinate to the figures; but, now and then, as in the pictures of 'Actaeon' and of the 'death of Icarus', the back-ground becomes so important that the picture may almost be classed as a landscape.

880. It is impossible to consider these pictures in detail, but one point of great importance must be noted. The pictures dating from the Augustan age and the first half of the first century A.D. differ conspicuously from the later pictures, which at Pompeii are copiously represented by paintings executed after the earthquake of A.D. 63. The former include relatively many

Mythological  
subjects.



subjects derived from tragedy or epic, the number of figures in each composition is often large, and the treatment of the theme is usually serious. In the later works, lighter subjects are more frequent, the number of figures is reduced, and the painter is less interested in the myth than in the display of beautiful forms; he shows a marked preference for the nude, and for a soft and effeminate type of figure. The treatment, likewise, is different. The earlier works are severe in style, smooth, and minutely finished; beauty of outline is studiously sought. In the later pictures, the painting is bolder; the colouring is warmer and is laid on broadly; the contours are intentionally left vague, and the artist aims at effects of colour and light rather than beauty of outline. The painting is intended to produce its effect from some distance.

881. With the mythological subjects may be ranged a class of pictures peculiarly characteristic of this Roman Art. Besides the definite representations of mythological scenes, which appear usually in the centre of a wall, in a space reserved for them in the scheme of decoration, we often find, especially in the later work, isolated figures or pairs of figures (most commonly Bacchantes or Fauns) painted directly upon the monochrome ground, as if floating in air. Some of these are of exquisite beauty, and unsurpassed by anything in ancient painting. Sometimes the mythological personage is replaced by a mortal, usually a dancing girl; but the difference is unimportant. Similarly, we sometimes find mythological scenes on a small scale introduced into the decorative friezes.

882. Among the *Genre* paintings there are two well-marked classes. In the one, scenes from daily life, often of the humblest kind, are presented in an idealised form; the actors in them being Genre. not ordinary mortals, but Cupids, Psyches, as young girls gracefully clad. We find such figures in scenes of many kinds, employed as bakers, cobblers, fullers, smiths, etc. etc.; and in outdoor occupations, hunting, fishing, grape-gathering, etc. In the second class, which is less common, and is found usually in the poorer houses, we have direct transcripts from life: a scene from the Forum, a shop, an inn, or the like, quite unidealised. Dress, type of face and figure, gestures and accessories are all reproduced, without any change from what the artist saw about him. As historical records, these pictures are of great interest, and, though the workmanship in most cases is rude, and beauty is not sought, the characterisation is often vivid and successful in a rough way. Intermediate between these two classes stand a number of pictures representing subjects connected with the theatre, either scenes from a definite play or incidents of theatrical life. In fineness of execution and general treatment, these resemble the *Genre* pictures of the first class, but differ from them in that the persons and costumes are not fanciful but actual. They are, however, not direct transcripts from life, but are ideal in the same sense as the Comedy, which they record, was ideal, for they represent the type, not the individual.

883. Not least interesting are the pictures of still-life and of animals.

Still-life.

These are invariably on a small scale, and are treated as part of the decorative scheme, rather than as independent paintings; but they are often of high merit and beauty. They usually represent edibles of some kind, such as bread, fruit, fish, and game. All these, though the execution is slight, are treated with much grace, and with a fine feeling for colour and texture. Both the fresco technique and their subordinate purpose forbid the minute fidelity of Dutch paintings of similar subjects, yet in sureness and lightness of touch, in the skilful suggestion of effects and in refinement of colour, the finest examples are worthy of comparison with the best products of modern art. Very similar in treatment and character are the small figures of living animals. These, like the last, are not minutely faithful, but show, besides the qualities mentioned, a fine power of seizing the characteristic in form and movement, and of rendering it with a few slight touches. In this they have been well compared to the animal paintings of Japan.

884. Less equal to the achievements of modern art are the landscapes,

Landscapes.

which have been found in great abundance in Rome and Pompeii. Of the existing examples, two stand out as unique in merit and interest; the paintings in the Villa of Livia at Prima Porta, and the scenes from the *Odyssey* found in a house on the Esquiline and now in the Vatican library. The paintings in the Villa of Livia run round the four walls of the room, and represent a grove of trees of all kinds, behind a paling of lattice work and a strip of turf, which together form the foreground. The trees, many of them bearing fruit, the birds which fly among them, the flowers upon the turf in front, are represented with fidelity and skill; and, a thing unusual in ancient paintings, the different species can be recognised. The general effect is pleasing; but, though the painting has been much praised and is undoubtedly the work of an artist superior to most of those employed on mural decoration, the treatment seems laboured, when compared with such works as the scenes from the *Odyssey*, and the *Genre* paintings. For, though the execution is broad, the art is still the art that seeks to render nature by detailed imitation rather than by a skilful suggestion of natural effect.

885. The scenes from the *Odyssey* are beyond doubt the finest specimens of ancient landscape, one might almost say of ancient painting, still extant. The series is incomplete but the surviving pictures give the episodes of the 'Læstrȳgōnēs' (Fig. 103), 'Circe', and the 'Under-world'. The scenes are divided by painted scarlet pilasters, but the landscape belonging to each episode is continuous, and the figures, though lively and expressive, are slightly treated and subordinate. The landscape, in most cases rocky, is natural, and fairly correct in perspective; the effect of distance is well given; there is atmosphere, and, in some cases, a considerable play of light and shade. The colouring too is wonderfully luminous. It is clear that the painter not merely desired to tell the story, and even to present a



Fig. 103. Landscape from the 'Odyssey'. The messengers of Odysseus meeting the daughter of Antiphætes, King of the Laestrygonés (*Od.* x 87—110). (Rome, Vatican Library; from Woermann, *Die Odyssee-landschaften vom Esquilin*, 1876.)

scene beautiful in detail, but, like a modern landscape painter, was largely interested in effects of colour and light, and, though his knowledge was in points incomplete, he is successful. Compared with these, most of the landscapes found elsewhere seem crude and incompetent. But there are marked differences among them. Some of the mythological scenes with extensive landscape backgrounds approach in merit and treatment those last mentioned, and some of the few landscapes on a large scale which have been discovered at Pompeii, though simple in colour and devoid of effects of light, are natural and fairly correct in perspective. Near to these stand certain decorative landscapes on a small scale, which are distinguished from the rest by greater simplicity of subject and composition. Frequently, these present nothing more than a bare strip of coast with a tree or two beside it, or perhaps a rustic shrine, or a sacred tree with a figure or two, and a few sheep grazing near. They are simple in colouring, in many cases actual monochromes, and both the treatment and the feeling are natural. But the most numerous class of decorative landscapes is wholly different. In these, which are always on a small scale, the painter has endeavoured to heap together as many pretty and interesting objects as possible; but with little regard to perspective. The colouring is vivid, but devoid of atmosphere, and there is little feeling for natural effect. Regarded as decoration, these pictures are pleasant and cheerful, but they do not represent a high form of landscape painting. In them we find nearly all the subjects enumerated by Pliny (in xxxv 116), and they give a vivid idea of the aspect of the Italian coast in Imperial times. The favourite subjects are either harbours with shipping and extensive buildings, or a coast-line or countryside crowded with villas and temples. In most cases, architecture of some kind is a conspicuous element. It is very possible that these panoramic pictures represent the type of art introduced by Ludius (§ 877), while the others, especially the pastoral subjects, are probably reflexions of Hellenistic painting.

886. With landscapes must be classed the small pictures of ships so frequently embedded, like the still-life pictures, in the decorative frieze. These usually contain only two or three ships, sometimes engaged in combat, with a stretch of sea, and perhaps a small island. They are slight in execution, but are often remarkable for the skill with which the desired effect is obtained by a few bold touches. Even more than the still-life pictures, they often recall the works of the modern 'impressionist school'.

887. At Pompeii there are some instances of portrait-heads introduced into the decoration; but these are few and unimportant, and our knowledge of this branch of art has recently been much enlarged by the discovery in Egypt of a large number of portrait-heads affixed to mummy-cases. These are all of the Imperial age, and the majority belong probably to the 3rd century A.D. Though the work of inferior artists, they give the impression of life-like and characteristic

Portraits.



portraits. The treatment is broad and pictorial, and the colouring has much depth and softness, due in part to the encaustic process used in their execution. The nature of this process is still obscure, but its chief characteristic is that the medium employed to bind the pigments was wax.

888. The wall-paintings, as before mentioned (§ 878), are executed in fresco and the method is essentially similar to that in use in the Middle Ages, though it is employed with a dexterity exceeding that of all later painters, and the care taken in the preparation of the ground made possible effects unattainable to them. It is also certain that the Romans, like the Greeks, were acquainted with the *tempera* method, but of this no certain examples survive. Like the encaustic process, it was doubtless employed chiefly for easel-pictures, and these have naturally perished.

889. In forming an estimate of Roman painting, it must never be forgotten that all we have left belongs to a subordinate form of art. But even this remnant gives proof of very high qualities. Though restricted by an imperfect knowledge of perspective, both linear and aerial (a restriction chiefly felt in the domain of landscape), it is in other respects worthy of comparison with the art of any age.

890. Such are the chief existing examples of Roman painting. Most of them fall in date within a comparatively brief period. Few, if any, of the Pompeian pictures are earlier than the last half-century before our era, and the majority were executed in the brief interval between the earthquake of 63 A.D. and the eruption of 79. In Rome, the finest specimens, *e.g.* the paintings on the Palatine and at the Villa of Livia, are of the Augustan age, and the scenes from the *Odyssey* belong, perhaps, to the same period, though some critics place them a century later. Many paintings have also been found in tombs of a later period, but these are not sufficiently different to call for special mention.

891. The artistic genealogy of these works is difficult to determine. It has generally been supposed that all the types above described, except the realistic *Genre*-pictures and, perhaps, the panoramic landscapes, are reflexions of later Greek art and contain nothing specifically Roman. But it has recently been maintained that, while the art of the Augustan age is in the main derivative, a style purely Roman, or at least Italian, was developed during the first century A.D. and reached maturity under the Flavian emperors. This view is undoubtedly supported by the fact already noticed that the later paintings at Pompeii, which can be accurately dated, differ in style from the earlier, and recall in a singular degree the latest modern developments of art. It is therefore probable that in these we have an original form of art. Whether that art was due to Italian influence, or to causes operating throughout the Empire, we cannot safely say, but at least it may fairly be designated as Roman.

892. On the other hand, it is beyond question that most of the paintings of the Augustan age are closely dependent upon Greek art; and many of them are adaptations, if not direct copies, of Greek originals.

And, even in the later period, though the treatment may be new, the subjects and artistic types are still, for the most part, of Greek or Hellenistic origin. It is a singular fact that, among the thousands of pictures known, not more than half-a-dozen present scenes from Roman history or mythology, or were inspired by Roman poetry. That historical subjects were occasionally treated, we have already seen (§ 876), and it is natural to suppose that such works as the sculptures on the Arch of Titus and the Column of Trajan had their counterparts in contemporary paintings, but of these no examples survive.

#### MOSAIC.

893. The art of mosaic is of high antiquity. Mosaics of terra-cotta

Mosaic.

had been early used in Chaldaea for the decoration of buildings; and, in Egypt, utensils were often adorned with mosaics in enamel. But the art did not come into vogue in the West before the Alexandrine age, though some specimens in Greece have erroneously been attributed to an earlier date. It was first extensively employed for pavements under the Ptolemies, and, though Pergamene artists are also mentioned, Egypt appears to have been the chief centre of manufacture, and the mosaics of Roman times in all parts of Europe show many traces of Egyptian origin.

894. Mosaic, in the elaborate and artistic forms practised in Egypt and elsewhere, appears to have been introduced into Rome towards the end of the 2nd century B.C.; though in rudimentary forms, such as the *opus signinum* described below, it may have been employed earlier. Unfortunately no generic term for mosaic is found in classical times, and there is some obscurity about the terms employed for the different species in use; but the three most important forms of mosaic proper were designated by terms of clearly defined meaning. These three were: *opus sectile*, *tessellatum*, and *vermiculatum*. *Opus signinum*, which properly designates merely a pavement of pounded tiles and chalk, was sometimes applied to a rudimentary form of mosaic, in which the ground is variegated with detached patterns of natural pebbles or cut stones. This style of pavement, common between 100 B.C. and 100 A.D., is apparently the simplest form of mosaic, but its simplicity is no evidence that it was actually the earliest form, and, under the Empire, all the forms were practised side by side.

895. Of the others, *opus sectile* is the simplest. This consists of small pieces of marble cut into various shapes and fitted together into a pattern. In its simplest form, it resembles the marble pavements sometimes used in churches, but the patterns were usually more varied, and the stones smaller. Not infrequently, however, floral devices and figures replace the geometrical pattern, but these are usually simple silhouettes. In rare cases only the workman has utilised the variations in the colour of the marble to give an appearance of relief. From

*Opus sectile.*

the nature of the case the use of this form of mosaic was restricted to pavements, and, owing to the scarcity of coloured marbles in Italy, it was less practised there than in the East.

896. In *opus tessellatum* the pattern is rendered by means of small, square dice of stone or marble, of various colours, but uniform size, set in a bed of cement and arranged in straight lines. As a rule, mosaics of this class are simple in colour—in most cases black and white only are employed—and restricted to geometrical patterns; for the rectilinear arrangement necessitated by the shape of the dice did not lend itself to complex forms. Such work was therefore found most frequently in the borders enclosing a composition.

897. Lastly, in *opus vermiculatum*, the marble dice, instead of being square, and of equal size, are of various shapes, usually rounded, and of various sizes, often very minute; and they are arranged in sinuous lines. These differences enable them better to follow the outline of the figure represented, and hence this is the form of mosaic employed in all elaborate works, where the objects were to be represented in their natural colours. Such works are innumerable, and in later times, often of great extent. At Pompeii they are usually small. The finer specimens were executed in the studio and afterwards transferred bodily to their destined place and set in a bed of cement. (Works so transferred were called *emblemata*.) The example here given (Fig. 104)




Fig. 104. Doves perched on the rim of a bowl. From a mosaic in the Capitoline Museum, Rome. (After Woltmann's *History of Painting*, 1880, i 94.)

appears to be a reproduction of a work of the Pergamenian artist Sôsus mentioned by Pliny (*N. H.* xxxvi 184). The popularity of this artist is further attested by the fact that another work of his, the *asarôtos oecos* there mentioned, is reproduced in two mosaics, one found in Africa, the other on the Aventine (*Bull. dell' Inst.* 1833, p. 82). It represents the pavement of a room, littered with the remnants of a meal, bones, crusts, etc.; a subject very suitable for the pavement of a dining room.

898. In Roman times mosaic was occasionally employed in the decoration of walls and other perpendicular surfaces,—there are a few examples of this at Pompeii—but until the 4th century such use was exceptional<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, mosaic pavements were widely used in all parts of the Empire. More than 3000 examples are still preserved, extending in date into Byzantine times. Except when external evidence is present, they cannot be dated precisely, but some broad distinctions are discernible. In the earlier period, which extends roughly to the end of the first century A.D., they retain many traces of their Alexandrine origin. The subjects represented are almost always Greek, and frequently Egyptian. Egyptian landscapes in particular (of which the great Palestrina mosaic offers a conspicuous example) are very popular. The use of *emblemata* is frequent, and the most common arrangement is a figure-subject or landscape, set in a border of geometrical or floral ornament. After this period mosaics of great extent become common, some of the largest covering over a hundred square yards. And they are now broken up into compartments. Instead of a single composition with its border, we find separate groups or figures enclosed in medallion-like spaces by ornamentation, which is itself divided into symmetrical compartments. This ornamentation is of great variety and often highly effective. At one time rich in floral devices and other natural forms, it gradually reverts, as art declines, to the geometrical type. At the same time, the distinction between *opus tessellatum* and *vermiculatum* becomes obscured. They are used together and almost indiscriminately for similar subjects. Gradually too the work becomes coarser, and, owing to the difficulty of procuring suitable materials, especially in remoter districts, the scale of colours is restricted. Yet, even in the remotest provinces, there must have been flourishing schools of mosaic, and fine work was often produced. Such works as the mosaics from Carthage in the British Museum show that even in the 6th century effective designs could still be produced.

899. There is likewise a change in the subjects employed. These are too multifarious to be enumerated here. They include almost all the classes mentioned under the head of painting, but certain points are noteworthy. As time goes on, scenes and persons from Roman legend replace the Greek subjects earlier in vogue, and the scenes from daily life, which become very frequent, appear in a contemporary dress. Again, as a natural consequence of the division into compartments, compositions

<sup>1</sup> Pliny (xxxvi 189) mentions its occasional use, even for vaults.



with landscape backgrounds give place to single figures, which, even if connected in subject, are often placed in separate spaces; and certain series of figures, such as the Muses, the Seasons, the Months, which lend themselves to this treatment, are frequently found.

900. After the age of Constantine mosaic, which, for some centuries, had been almost confined, at least in the West, to pavements, migrated again to walls and vaults. Thus employed, it changed its character and was found capable of splendid achievements, but these fall under the head of Byzantine, rather than of Roman art. This new art owed its effect less to fineness of execution than to splendour of colour, especially the use of gold. Roman mosaic, though it employed glass and other artificial substances to supplement the natural marble, and often showed the finest taste in the assortment of different tints, restricted itself to a comparatively sober, and, in figure subjects, to a naturalistic scale of colour.

No adequate account of Roman painting or mosaic exists in English; but reference may be made to the article *Pictura* in Smith's *Bibliography. Dictionary of Antiquities*; to the 1st volume of Woltmann's *History of Painting* and to the articles *Roman Art* (c) and *Mosaic* (vol. xviii 883-7) in the last ed. of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The most valuable works upon the subject, in German, are Helbig's *Wandgemälde der verschütteten Städte Campaniens*, and *Campanische Wandmalerei*, Wörmann's *Landschaft in der Kunst der alten Völker*, and Mau's *Geschichte der decorativen Wandmalerei in Pompeji* (Berlin, 1882). Among works in French, the article *Musivum Opus* in Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des antiquités etc.* is exhaustive and admirable. Reproductions of the Pompeian paintings are to be found in many publications; of these the most modern, and by far the most valuable, is Paul Herrman's *Denkmäler der Malerei*, Munich (1906-, in progress). Of older works, W. Zahn's *Schönsten Ornamente etc.* is the most comprehensive; E. Presuhn's *Pompeii, die neuesten Ausgrabungen*, contains other examples, and the same author's *Pompeianische Wand-decorationen* is also valuable. Reproductions of mosaics are to be found in T. Morgan's *Romano-British Mosaic Pavements*. Recent views upon the technique of Roman paintings may be found in F. Gerlich, *Die Technik der römisch-pompeianischen Wandmalerei*, in *Neue Jahrbücher für das kl. Altertum*, xxi (2) 1908; of which there is an abstract in the *Classical Quarterly*, Oct. 1908, p. 317. Ernst Berger's *Maltechnik des Alterthums* (1904) is criticised in Dr A. P. Laurie's *Greek and Roman Methods of Painting* (1910), which contains the clearest and most satisfactory account of the subject yet published. For advanced students Prof. Wickhoff's *Roman Art* is of great value, but the opinions there advanced are open to controversy.

## VIII. LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE.

### VIII. I. LITERATURE.

#### A. POETRY TO THE END OF THE AUGUSTAN AGE.

901. WE propose in this article, not to trace the development of Roman poetry, but rather to give a brief appreciation of those poets whose works, or some of them, are extant and entire, and who deserve, or are likely to receive, the attention of students reading for pleasure.

Following this plan, we shall have unhappily little to say of the first century and a half which followed 'the coming of the wing-foot Muse to the folk of Romulus warlike and wild'. It was at the time of the decisive contests with Carthage (about 250 B.C.), that the Romans first set themselves, with the help of the mature models furnished by Greece, to make a national literature. The early period (250—100 B.C.), and even the earliest, was indeed of vital importance. Then was created, chiefly in epic and tragedy, the vocabulary and the forms of language, with which the higher poetry of Rome was built; for it is probable that, in linguistic material, Lucretius, Catullus, and their successors, innovated very little. The tragedy of the second century B.C., represented chiefly by Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius, the historical epic of Naevius (end of third century), and, above all, the great historical epic of Ennius, completed shortly before his death in 169 B.C., would be the essential documents of the story. Not less important was the work of Lucilius (*ob.* 102 B.C.), the founder of satire, and perhaps in the literary field the most original mind of his nation. Many other names survive, and many more, significant in their day, must be lost.

902. But, for the whole age, we possess, apart from casual fragments and notices largely second-hand and disputable, only the two comic poets Plautus and Terence,—these indeed in somewhat surprising completeness. Nothing can be inferred from this to the prejudice of what we have lost. The better preservation of ancient Comedy is accounted for, apart from accident, by the fact that Comedy could plead a better licence, than more ambitious poetry, for the breach of those technical rules, developed by the

closer study of Greek, which, in and after the Augustan age, were regarded as essential to verse having any pretension to dignity. The polite but firm depreciation, with which Horace (*Ars Poët.* 258 f) treats the 'nobiles trimetros Acci' and the verses of Ennius 'in scaenam missos cum magno pondere', sufficiently explains why schools and professors should have let Ennius and Accius perish entirely, before parting with a single work of the chief comedians.

903. But of Ennius, in particular, something must be said even here, since Roman poetry without Ennius is a column wanting the base.

Q. Ennius: 239—169 B.C.; born at Rudiae in Calabria; served as soldier in youth; lived mainly at Rome by literature (teaching Greek; translating, adapting, and composing plays, etc.), under patronage of Cato, Scipio Africanus (Maior), and others; received Roman citizenship 184 B.C.; his epic, *Annales*, occupied his last 20 years. Ennius.

To the Romans, the language of the *Annales* was consecrated and magical. The pith and key of Virgil's *Aeneid* is given by the verse in which the hero describes the religious sanction of his enterprise (iii 11):—

'feror exsul in altum  
cum sociis natoque, Penatibus et magnis dis',

and that in which the same sanction is invoked for the victorious founder of the Empire (viii 678):—

'hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar,  
cum patribus populoque, Penatibus et magnis dis'.

By mere accident we know that it was Ennius who furnished the strange, solemn termination, in his

'dono ducite, doque, uolentibu' cum magnis dis',—

a fact vital to its effect on a people for whom the *Annales* was the chief basis of literary education. This work in 18 books, a poetical history of Rome from the legendary beginning to the time of the author, determined the starting-point of the national literature, and foreshowed the development. It determined the full adoption of the Greek quantitative system<sup>1</sup> in preference to the principles (whatever these were) of the native 'Saturnian', previously used not only in important translations from the Greek (the *Odyssey* of Liuius Andronicus), but for the national poem of Nacuius on the Punic War. The choice was probably inevitable; to us, at all events, such a line as 'aut in Pylum obueniens, aut ibi ommentans' (Andronicus) hardly suggests Latin verse at all; but all the greater is the breach with native instinct which the choice demanded; this was among the chief causes which gave to Roman poetry its peculiar note of art and stateliness, and, on the other hand, limited its range. It was Ennius who created the Latin hexameter and fixed the main principles of its structure. It was

<sup>1</sup> See Article on Metre, *infra*.

he, who, following indeed the precedent of Naeuius and obeying doubtless the law of Roman demand, gave to the State and to public history the permanent place of honour as the principal subject even of poetry. This was new, but it remained to the last, and is characteristic of Roman poetry from Ennius to Virgil, from Virgil to Lucan, and even to Juvenal. Cicero, in his speech *pro Archia*, pleading the claims of literature, assumes that its principal function is the direct honour and glorification of the State. He speaks perhaps the popular sentiment rather than his own; but the sentiment is all the more important. It did not come from Greece, and has not been transmitted, generally speaking, to the European literatures which are derived from the Graeco-Roman. But, in Roman poetry proper, the high and dominant conception of the State, as imposing destiny, demanding sacrifice, and crushing opposition, is never far absent, and often principal. It makes the pathos of Virgil and the power of Lucan. Even the philosophy of Lucretius, the romance of Propertius, the spleen of Juvenal, are all seen, as it were, in relief against this background.

And in another characteristic respect, the genius of Roman verse was fixed, if not actually evoked, by Ennius. We see already in him, and to him we must ascribe in some measure, the immense part, among the possible qualities of metrical composition, which Latin assigns to mere sonority. This is a matter of vital importance to our study, and must have its place in the most summary consideration. Poetry has many instruments of pleasure, thought, for example, phrasing, and sound. These, though they cannot be actually separated, are essentially distinct, and may be proportioned with infinite variety. Men, and also nations, differ widely in the proportional estimate of them,—a fact which is at the bottom of much, and not always profitable, controversy. Now, in the Latin art of language, mere sonority plays a part far larger than usual. Prose, as well as verse, displays this characteristic. When Cicero marks his sense of the ultimate difference between his own art and that of the most approved foreign model, by saying that ‘not even Demosthenes seems to fill his ears’ (*Or.* 104), he shows the same taste as the national poets, the taste which is already conspicuous in Ennius. Take this bit from the *Annales*, describing the simple fact that certain persons felled some timber:—

‘incedunt arbusta per alta, securibu’ caedunt :  
percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex,  
fraxinu’ frangitur atque abies consternitur alta,  
pinus proceras peruortunt : omne sonabat  
arbustum fremitu siluæ frondosæ.’

The thought here is nothing; no art is sought or shown in the expression, which is rather rude and clumsy; but the music, the mere sound, is exquisitely studied, and in this the piece could hardly be matched, unless by some other Latin. It is designed, like all Latin poetry, for recitation. We must read it aloud, and with precision, to get the sole thing at which it



aims, the purely sensuous effect produced by the hush and wail of the last verse, coming upon the hardness and harshness of the preceding. And be it carefully observed, that this effect, if connected at all with the meaning of the sentence, is connected only in some obscure way defying analysis,—the way in which music itself, apart from any words, may be associated with particular meaning. If that is here doubtful, take some other instance, anywhere in Roman literature,—this, for example, at random from Horace (*Odes*, ii 1, 33):—

‘qui gurgēs aut quæ flumina lugubris  
ignara belli? quod mare Dauniæ  
non decolorauere caedes?  
quæ caret ora cruore nostro?’—

one of the cardinal sentiments which penetrate and constitute the poetry of the *Odes*. The musical treatment here is as bold as it is elaborate. We may, quite legitimately, not admire it; we may feel that the conjunction of sounds in *ora cruore*, an effect for which the whole stanza is a preparation, goes beyond the mark. But this effect, bad or good, rather than anything in the thought or phrasing, is conceived as the essence of the poet's business, and his chief instrument. If we are indifferent to this side of poetry, we should seek other poetry than Latin, where such things will, of course, be found, but have not the same, nor nearly the same, importance. It was not in Greek, but in the national habit, that Ennius found this tendency, and he helped to fix it.

With his mistakes or marks of immaturity (such as an alleged hexameter consisting of six spondaic words) we have now no concern. Our informants, collectors of curiosities, probably accent them more than enough. Nor can we discuss the question (though it has an importance for Roman literature generally) touching the value and legitimacy of historical epic, in itself. We must pass on to the subject of drama.

904. Here also, as well as in narrative poetry, the founders of Roman literature showed the peculiarly Roman inclination to associate art with the commonwealth and with public concerns.

Drama.

The *praetexta* (*fabula*)<sup>1</sup>, that is to say, historical drama taking its subject from contemporary, or, at any rate, actual events, appears already with Næuius, and was cultivated down to the last age of the Republic, perhaps later. In this form, which was substantially new, and certainly not inspired from Greece, the Romans, from their genius and interests, might have been expected to achieve dramatic success. We have no specimens by which to judge it, but the evidence does not prove that the species was prolific, and still less that it was popular.

It is indeed doubtful—and this goes to the root of the matter—how far any form of literary drama was, properly speaking, popular at Rome. Even Comedy, as we shall presently see, had a hard fight with more

<sup>1</sup> So called from the Roman dress of dignity worn by the performers. Compare the *togatae* and *palliatæ* hereafter mentioned.

material entertainments. We might presume, and it is expressly indicated<sup>1</sup>, that Tragedy, in the competition, had a worse, not a better, chance. But a spontaneous public interest is necessary to drama, which cannot live merely upon a reading class. Roman Tragedy has strong marks of this dependence. Following Greek legends for the story, and adhering closely to actual Greek compositions in the framework and even the language, it could not appeal to living interests, and was doomed to exhaustion. Nor does it appear that the ancient Italians, though quick in acting and mimicry, were strong in the intellectual faculty of personation, the suggestion, perhaps altogether illusory, that the artist has entered into the actual feelings of another person, and speaks, as it were, from the centre of the assumed character. This question, which is of the first importance and interest, extends beyond the range of formal drama, and may be studied (for instance) in the historical characters of Livy, or in the personages of the *Aeneid*; but we must here be content merely to indicate it. Himself, or his conception of himself, a Roman could powerfully exhibit; witness Lucretius, Horace, Propertius, and many others. In incisive description of persons and manners, Latin literature is strong: but in character, not clearly. The Tragedy of Ennius and his successors had pomp perhaps in excess, but possibly no other tragic quality in high measure. When we find Ennius converting that speech of Euripides' desolate Medea<sup>2</sup>, which begins with

Κορίνθιαί γυναῖκες, ἐξῆλθον δόμων...

into this,

'quae Corinthi arcem altam habetis, matronae opulentae optimates...'

we may admire indeed the sonorous music, and may admit that Greek, or at least the Greek of Euripides, could hardly have matched it; but we must also question how, with such an apparatus of diction, it was possible to preserve the character or the essence of the Euripidean story. The criticism of Horace, in the *Ars Poetica* and elsewhere, and the manner in which he insists upon the most elementary rules of dramatic composition, imply a clear opinion that the drama of Rome, as it ought to exist, was still substantially to be created. This may be worth remembering, when we pass to the consideration of that branch, Comedy, of which we have adequate specimens. Plautus and Terence, after long enjoying a monopoly of classic credit in this department, now suffer perhaps unduly in practical competition for the attention of readers, because we are not sufficiently warned, what merits we are *not* to expect

905. T. Maccius Plautus: about 254—184 B.C.; born at Sassina in Umbria; poor; after vicissitudes, escaped manual labour by success as composer and adapter of comedies. Of 21 plays reckoned genuine, 20 are extant.

<sup>1</sup> See the prologue to the *Captivi* of Plautus.

<sup>2</sup> Eur. *Med.* 214 f.

The material and model of Roman Comedy were derived mainly from the 'New Comedy' of Athens, produced between 400 and 200 B.C. The Athenian drama of this period was essentially an imitation of contemporary life, a Comedy of manners and normal characters, consisting of subtle variations upon the most familiar types of society, fathers and sons, masters and slaves, husbands and wives. In the chief authors of this style, such as Menander and Philemon, as we see from the conscientious imitations of Terence and other indirect evidence, the 'comic' element—in the sense which that epithet now generally bears and has long borne, *i.e.* 'calling for laughter'—was slight and altogether subordinate. The exhibition of character, even in the most ordinary scenes and commonplace relations, is not necessarily connected, and is not indeed even compatible, with the pursuit of laughter as a main object. So soon as we are intellectually interested in the perception of truth, or morally interested in problems of conduct, or aesthetically in qualities of emotion, mere amusement becomes an accident and even an adjunct. 'Comedy' of this kind is perhaps the most delicate, though not the most powerful, of literary arts. In a homogeneous, closely united, and highly cultivated society, it may be adapted with success to the theatre; but this connexion is precarious and not essential. In modern literature, and especially in English, similar aims have principally found expression in the Essay and the Novel. Athenian society was sufficiently coherent and self-centred to admit them upon the stage. The plots of the 'New Comedy' were simple and transparent, not because the authors lacked invention, but because, as reflexion will show, this condition is favourable, if not necessary, to extreme subtlety in the discrimination of character. A theatrical audience, even the most intelligent, cannot attend to many things at once, and if the appeal is to the intelligence, it must be made, so far as possible, to this alone.

906. Now in Rome an audience for drama of this kind did not exist, at all events in the age of Plautus or Terence. Literary entertainment was a concession to the taste of a small superior circle (including the nobles and magistrates who 'gave the shows'), and was imposed upon a somewhat impatient public, as an interlude in performances resembling those of a modern circus. The literary incompetence and rude indisposition of the masses is vividly exhibited to us in such documents as the prologue to the *Prisoners* of Plautus, almost the sole piece *Captivi.* in which the author seriously attempts to swim against the stream. The plot turns entirely upon a double impersonation, in which two persons pass themselves off, each for the other. A master and slave, being made prisoners of war, exchange parts, in order that the master, at the risk of the slave, may obtain release. This simple substitution, the motive of it, and the result to be achieved, are explained and re-explained, in the prologue and repeatedly in the play, with an insistence which assumes that the spectators will be slow to understand and quick to forget. They are actually reminded that the piece is a story, a connected series of events

and a supposed reality; and the way in which a plot is habitually treated by Plautus shows that he had little faith in the power of his audience to grasp this elementary fact. They are assured (*v.* 58) that, though the subject is war, there is no desire to betray them into a tragedy. They are earnestly requested to approve, that is, to condone, the absence, or rather the severe restriction, of the indecency and irrelevant buffoonery, by which, as we see elsewhere, they were habitually propitiated.

907. For such a public Plautus, in general, frankly caters, putting together, out of materials mainly intended for a different purpose, something which they may be expected to tolerate.

*Stichus.*

This method, which must be understood, if he is to be estimated fairly, is best seen in an exaggerated, and so far unfortunate, example,—the *Stichus*.

Two sisters of good position marry two brothers of the same rank; the husbands, in the course of things and without their fault, become poor, and go abroad to repair their fortunes by commerce. When they have been away for some years, the father of the two wives, an unscrupulous old rascal, urges his daughters to form new connexions. The ladies' fidelity is rewarded by the triumphant return of the travellers. The father, by flattery and cynical wit, escapes retribution; other persons concerned in the business fare according to their deserts.—Fragments of a Greek original, in which this very promising idea was presumably worked out, are represented, more or less imperfectly, in the Plautine version (*Stichus* Act I, and Act IV, Sc. 1). But, in Plautus, the story is quickly thrust aside, to make room for matter more 'comic'—a hungry and impudent dependant in quest of a dinner,—a pert little page, so excited that he is half unable, half unwilling, to disclose his errand,—and so on, and so on. The part of the starveling, a type greatly appreciated and favoured by an audience radically cruel, has been largely expanded, if not introduced from another source, by Plautus himself. (See *v.* 193, and compare the similar and similarly injurious interpolations in the *Captivi*.) 'Stichus', from whom the play is named, is a slave who returns with one of the travelling brothers. It must be assumed that, in the original story, he played an important part in the machinery. In Plautus, the machinery being mostly cut out, Stichus becomes a mere excuse for a wild debauch of the servants, which forms the *finale*. With all these accretions, the piece is short, almost everything relevant to the main idea having been expunged. After the first scene, the sisters, upon whose characters the story turns, hardly appear. Their father also is so far obliterated, that the wit of the reconciliation between him and his sons-in-law (Act IV, Sc. 1) is out of tone and hardly intelligible. On the other hand, the comic business never flags, and almost every scene would be sure of a laugh. The language is admirable for the purpose, crisp, vigorous, and (for a native) perfectly easy.

908. Not all the plays, perhaps not any, are so loosely treated as this;

*Miles Gloriosus.*

but the method is everywhere the same, and needs the like allowance. In the *Braggart Soldier*, the really interesting though disagreeable characters of Periplecomenus and Acroteleutium (a man and a woman of the world, witty and cynical) are handled bluntly, while the 'Braggart', a popular type but a mere grotesque, is exaggerated beyond the limits of tolerable caricature. The Miser of the *Aulularia* has the like merit and defect. As specimens advantageous to the method we

*Rudens.*

may take the *Menaechmi*, *Bacchides*, and *Trinummus*. The *Rudens* is still more pleasing and harmonious, and, so far as



appears, may represent the original design practically without admixture of extraneous elements, or disproportionate exaggeration.

909. Reality, imitation of life, is, in Plautus, not pretended. Manners and allusions from Greece and from Rome are mixed without scruple; the personages explain these transitions, when necessary, to the audience, and otherwise talk to them freely. Such a style of entertainment is, of course, perfectly admissible, but requires its own material. Unfortunately the main framework of Plautus' pieces is incongruously taken from the Comedy of life and reality. An exception is the *Amphitryo*, success-  
fully adapted by Molière, which exhibits the entanglements

*Amphitryo.*

produced by Jupiter, when (according to Greek legend) he personated the husband of Alcmena. Here the author has a congenial form. The play itself, which frequently and necessarily explains to the Roman audience what ought to have been notorious, shows why this mythological vein could not be freely worked. From the political liberties of the Athenian 'Old Comedy', Plautus, who by his vigour might have rivalled Aristophanes, was debarred by the discipline of Rome.

The cheating and trickery of slaves, as a large element in the machinery, is doubtless derived from Athens, but not so the persistent and revolting allusions to crucifixion and other tortures, to which the Roman actors, as they remind us, were personally liable. These are local, and stamp the public. The author himself, it should be said, had a different taste (see the pathetic passage in *Miles Gloriosus*, 372 f). But in this, as in all, he mainly followed the stream. His actual achievement, considering the conditions, is excellent. But he had no adequate opportunity; and the accidental authority and influence of his works, in the beginnings of modern literature, were by no means purely advantageous.

910. P. Terentius: 185—159 B.C.; called 'Afer' from birth in Africa (and Carthaginian parentage?); brought to Rome as slave; educated and manumitted by *Terentius* Lucanus; patronised by Scipio Aemilianus and his circle; six comedies, 166—160 B.C.; died on voyage to Greece. Terence.

Terence has some external resemblance to Plautus, but is in spirit totally different. He is a scrupulous literary artist, whose sole object is to put into Latin as much of his Athenian models as would bear transference or could be made intelligible. He had little esteem for his audience, and his prologues—which are prefaces to publication, and not introductions for the stage—suggest that his public success was equivocal. His work is really addressed to his literary patrons. The performance of it had, to some extent, the character of a missionary effort, persistent in the face of disapprobation. One of his six plays, *The Mother-in-Law*<sup>1</sup>, we know to have sustained two disasters, and to have been actually repeated again. The merits of this much-contested piece have been variously

<sup>1</sup> Ἐκύρα. Perhaps rather *Mothers-in-Law*, for there are two (both important) in the plot.

judged by posterity, as by contemporaries; but a careful study of it is the best approach to the purpose and method of the author.

**gri.** It is not in the least laughable; indeed the story,—which turns upon a painful misbelief, inevitable though in fact unwarranted, existing in the mind of *Hecyra*, a young husband and father, with regard to the honour of his wife and his child,—narrowly escapes tragedy. But the cloud is finally dispersed, and this (as one of the personages remarks) not ‘after the common fashion of the stage’ by a general, inopportune, and impossible disclosure of secrets, but really, with due respect to all susceptibilities, and in a manner not less natural than ingenious. At the end, a shrewd and trusty old servant, whose inconvenient knowledge might easily have wrecked everything, and who has with great difficulty been kept out of the way, must needs be satisfied with sufficient explanations,—a very delicate business. *But he is told nothing; he sees.* Here is the close and climax of the conversation:—

*Parmeno.* And now, my lord, may I be informed what I have done for you, and what all this is about?

*Pamphilus.* You...may...not. (*A pause.*)

*Parm.* But...I have a notion. (*To himself*) I have given him new life, says he. What should that mean?

*Pamph.* You *do not know* how useful you have been, and from what you have saved me.

*Parm.* Oh yes, I do..., and...I did it on purpose!

*Pamph.* Of course, of course. (*A pause.*)

*Bacchis.* Parmeno is a person not likely to miss *any* opportunity of usefulness. (*They regard one another. Exit Bacchis.*)

*Pamph.* I am going in. Come, Parmeno. (*Exit.*)

*Parm.* I am coming. (*To himself*) I have done more good, without meaning it, than ever I did when I meant. (*Curtain.*)

Certainly such a *finale* would not be much to the taste of a holiday-mob, nor, indeed, of an average audience anywhere. But it is fine art, exquisite in its kind, and the whole play is on the same plane. Excitement we are not to expect, and scarcely amusement, in the common sense of the word, but for gentle humour and gentle pathos it would be hard to do better.—

*Phormio.* Equally harmonious, and lighter in tone, is the *Phormio*, based upon the errors of a gentleman (no villain, but weak), who has a wife in Athens, and another wife with a daughter in Lemnos. The second family comes without notice to Athens, where the mother dies, and the daughter secretly espouses her own cousin, both being ignorant of their relationship. The discovery, after complications, brings general content,—not without poetical justice upon the bigamist.—The *Self-punisher* and the *Brothers* deal with the problem of father and son, the conflict between affection and government.

Both plays are good; but the subtle *dénouement* of the *Brothers*, in which control defeats indulgence by pretending extravagant concessions, is obscure, probably in consequence of ‘cutting’ by the adapter. Both, moreover, combine materials distinct in origin and not perfectly congruous, a defect still more visible in the *Eunuch*, where the braggart compares unfavourably

with the gross, but congenial, handling of Plautus.—The *Woman from Andros* is a confessed mixture of two plays by Menander.

The prologue excuses this method (*contaminatio*), but only by Roman precedents, which do not touch the question of art. Menander, we may presume, would not have admitted that his *Andrian* and *Perinthian* were practically identical, and might be rolled together without injury. The process was a ready, though dangerous, way to repair the clipping prompted by transfer to a foreign language and ill-prepared readers. The *Hecyra* itself, for instance, is founded upon an incident (v 1, 31) which, had it occurred in Rome, would have had a moral and social complexion inconsistent with the characters and significance of the Athenian story. The persons are neither of the age nor the city of Terence, and cannot be seen rightly without an imaginative reconstitution of the medium. This general condition accounts for the undeniable timidity of drawing and thinness of colour, as well as for the occasional obscurity, which explain the description of Terence by Iulius Caesar as 'half a Menander'. But he is admirable in himself, and, as a reflexion of the lost Athenians, historically invaluable. In purity of style he has no Roman superior, and he must keep his place, so long as Latin is read at all.

912. The only full equivalent for the Greek drama of manners would have been a drama of Roman manners equally artistic, and produced *mutatis mutandis* by original invention. This form of play, named *togata* from the Roman costume, in contrast to the *palliata*, which retained the Greek, was eventually attempted, but we have no specimens. The traditional Roman judgment, which claimed complete success in this line for L. Afranius (c. 120 B.C.), is cited, but not endorsed, by Horace (*Epp.* ii 1, 57).

Afranius.

913. On the whole, both in the theatre and elsewhere, poetry at Rome, after a century or more of practice, though much had been achieved in thought and more in beauty, was still without sufficient root in present and personal life. The political and social frame left insufficient room for the individuality of the artist. This defect was conspicuous by comparison with the Athenian model, of which one chief province, the bold and mordant political Comedy of the fifth century B.C., was still untouched. But in the age of the Gracchi, in the beginning of a revolution, if Rome had no Aristophanes, it was not for want of material. To fill this place was apparently the aim of Gaius Lucilius (180—102 B.C.)—a man of independent means and good position—distinguished in this respect from the dependants, humble or even servile, by whom poetry had been mainly carried on. The destruction of his work is a loss in information, possibly even in pleasure, comparable to that of the *Annales*. In form it was singularly unpretentious; rather we should say that it had no form at all. The whole is described by Horace (*Sat.* ii 1, 30 f) as a sort of literary diary or commonplace-book, 'the picture

Lucilius.

of the man's life', the recipient of his confidences about things in general. Verse, chiefly hexameters, was the principal medium, verse extremely careless, and produced—according to the author—as rapidly as prose. But this negligence covered, and was probably designed to cover, a grave purpose. Horace (*Sat.* i 4, 6) also describes Lucilius as 'wholly dependent', for his art and material, upon Aristophanes and the 'Old Comedy' of Athens. The generality of this description must be limited and understood in the light of the other statement; but it shows,—and this is confirmed by all notices,—that what was new and impressive in Lucilius was the personal note and the bold invective, which spared not even the highest ranks and greatest reputations. That the publisher of such work had troubles, and sometimes, as another of his successors tells us, 'broke his jaw in his bite'<sup>1</sup>, is not surprising. It is a problem rather, which we cannot solve, how, under such a government as that of Rome, he used so much freedom as (it would appear) he did. But, in both its aspects, both as a frank exhibition of the writer's own mind, and as a frank comment upon society, the 'Miscellanies' of Lucilius had a profound effect. They gave to *Miscellany* (*satūra*) a new meaning, and founded a species of literature, which the Romans could claim as original<sup>2</sup>. Their authority is proved by the humorous complaints of Horace, that many persons seemed to suppose negligent composition, because it was a quality of Lucilius, to be the necessary condition of free criticism. Lucilius performed for Roman poetry a sort of Socratic service. He turned it to practical bearing on the thought and morality of the nation.

The remains, the casual citations of scholars, are oddly unsatisfying. Of careless composition they give proof enough. But they are mere scraps, and the 'satire', the main characteristic, is not represented at all.

914. In the next age, the last half-century of the Republic, the general advance of education produced an effect in poetry similar to that enrichment by philosophy, which appears in Cicero as the distinction of the time in the domain of oratory. The two supreme poets, who now represent it, Lucretius (c. 97—53 B.C.) and Catullus (87—c. 54 B.C.), both exhibit the influence of widening studies, the one in speculation, the other in metrical experiment. But in neither case does historical explanation carry us far. Neither, so far as we know, had any near affinity either to predecessors or successors. Their individual characters and personal genius are what we shall here endeavour, not to account for, but to describe.

915. The poem of Lucretius (c. 97—53 B.C.), a philosophical treatise in hexameters, *De rerum natura*, is perhaps unique, among Lucretius. poetry of the first rank, in its purpose, and the relation of its purpose to art. The purpose is genuinely scientific,—to convince the reader of certain doctrines respecting the constitution of the world, the nature, destiny, and true position of man. The 'poetry' of the work,

<sup>1</sup> Persius, i 115.

<sup>2</sup> Quintilian, x 1, 93, 'satūra quidem tota nostra est'.



its effect upon the imagination, is inseparable from the fanatical faith of the author in the solidity and universal importance of his doctrine. Not even to the epics of religion, *Paradise Lost* or the *Divina Commedia*, is this statement applicable in the same sense or to the same extent. The theory, which Lucretius undertakes to prove, is the *certain* (not probable) dissolution of the soul, as well as the body, by death. The means of proof is the 'atomistic' system of Epicurus<sup>1</sup>. Manifestly, if the conclusion is strictly *indubitable*, the ordinary lives of men, their hopes, fears, and behaviour generally, are a mass of error; and religion in particular is a gratuitous and horrible aggravation of human distress. That is the author's belief. According to him, the sole satisfaction really open to man is the perception of the facts, the comprehension of that fortuitous and temporary concourse of atoms, our world, in which he, as a still more ephemeral combination, plays so singular a part. This perception, the opening of the mind to this truth, he describes as a conquest, 'a victory which exalts us to the height of heaven' (i 79). Whether the average reader, if convinced, would share this enthusiasm, may be doubted; but it must be felt, we must sympathize with it, at least for the moment, if we are to enter into the spirit of the work. And this sympathy Lucretius can create.

Once indeed (ii 1 f), we are told that the philosopher derives happiness from the contemplation of the general error:—

‘*Suaue mari magno...alterius spectare laborem.*’

And this sentiment is perhaps the most notorious in the poem, possibly because it comes nearest to what most of us might suppose to be the natural result of the opinions professed. But it is obviously inconsistent with an effort to spread the truth; and in fact nothing is further from Lucretius than the wish to enjoy a private enlightenment. His note is that of the preacher and missionary, the intense desire to make converts, which marks a fanatical faith.

The connexion of poetry with such an enterprise is acknowledged by the author to be surprising; but poetry, he says, is ‘the honey at the edge of the cup’<sup>2</sup>, by which childish humanity may be beguiled into swallowing the medicine of truth. The unpalatable dose is to be overlaid with artful charm. The figure is exact, and precisely describes the Lucretian method. For example, the proposition of the atomist, that the atoms, the minute solid elements of which ‘things’ are made, must be themselves absolutely indivisible, flashes upon us with a vividness more persuasive than logic, when we are suddenly told that, were it otherwise, ‘a touch would kill us’ (i 215—264). And the same principle glows with all the glory of spring, when we are led to see in it the cause why the young brood of the year

‘*ludit lacte nouo mentes perculsa nouellas.*’

<sup>1</sup> § 1048 f *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> i 935 f, and elsewhere.

The infinity of space, and the endless movement of the atoms therein, conceptions so far from picturable, that they are not even imaginable, are nevertheless enforced by a whole series of pictures, sharp and unforgettable; as, for instance, when it is said, that otherwise there could be no life at all, since, in any limited room, all matter, given unlimited time, must have massed into one changeless solid (i 994):—

‘quippe ubi materies omnis cumulata iaceret  
ex infinito iam tempore subsidendo’.

It is surely impossible not to feel, for the instant, a partiality for the assumption by which we may escape from the image suggested by this last verse. And we cannot read far anywhere without coming upon something of the same kind. Principles and logic, which kindle in the reasoner these amazing sparks of fancy and feeling, seem themselves to become objects of desire; and this is the note of the Lucretian poetry.

Hence the *De rerum natura* is not fairly representable by extracts. There are passages capable of detachment, such as the sacrifice of Iphigenia (i 84), or the roll of the dead (iii 1024), or that sermon on death (iii 830 to the end), of which the death-roll is a part. But they are properly seen only in connexion with the argumentative whole; and it is the lights, which play over the argument, that best reveal the strange enthusiasm of Lucretius.

A real, scientific conviction, that man is absolutely and entirely mortal, is perhaps a rare thing, and has no resemblance or affinity to the uncertain dallying with such speculations, which is found on all sides, which we see in Horace and others, and which generally passes under the Epicurean name. The real thing seems to be normally and naturally incompatible with the artistic temper and with enthusiasm of any kind. The result of it, in an ardent nature, is likely to be suicide (which was in fact the end of Lucretius), and its normal result is quietude, the ἀταξία of Epicurus, that is to say, the reduction of the aesthetic and emotional life to the narrowest possible limits. But in Lucretius this intellectual belief was strangely linked with that sort of exaltation which more often accompanies ‘the larger hope’, and with emotional cravings which no logic could still or appease. His poem itself proves that he had known furious passion: and there is no improbability in the hint of domestic tragedy, which is almost all that remains in the way of biography. In the partition of his soul, the ‘senses that cleave to earth’ were coupled, not as in Goethe’s Faust and in average humanity, with ‘yearnings that soar’, but with a persuasion, passionate as love itself, that the fields of the universe contain no object of yearning whatsoever. He believed, with the intensity of religion, that men in general might be raised to his own fervour of pride, if they could share his certainty of a near and complete extinction. The outcome of this extraordinary and tragic temperament—the *docti furor arduus Lucreti*<sup>1</sup>, ‘the

<sup>1</sup> Statius, *Silvae*, ii 7, 76.

soaring philosophic frenzy of Lucretius'—is a poem so remote from common-sense, that the tradition which declares it to have been composed 'in the intervals of madness', though probably false, is easily explicable; but, when the position is once seized, and the language sufficiently familiar, it produces, by its austerity of rapture, an impression absolutely unique.

916. The part of the poem most acceptable at first sight, and in which the single traits of beauty are the most conspicuous, is the fifth book, a poetical history of the development of society from primitive savagery. But the substance of the work (and the key to the position) is contained in the first three books, which are substantially finished, and might stand by themselves.

The weight and solemnity of Latin suit the attitude of Lucretius perfectly, and, as a model of the poetical effects peculiar to the language, he was never surpassed. A consistently harmonious versifier he could not be. A music continuous, like that of Virgil, would not fit such a discourse, even if Lucretius could have compassed it. But, in single movements of rhythm, such as:—

'qui genus humanum ingenio superauit, et omnes  
restinxit, stellas exortus ut aetherius sol' (iii 1043),

he attains perfection; and, in fact, most of the artifices of Virgil may be found in him, though not the richness and variety of combination.

917. Valerius Catullus: 87—c. 54 B.C.; born at Verona; good position and independent means; lived in Rome or at country-seats, especially at Sirmio (Lake of Garda); long intrigue with woman of society whom he calls Catullus. 'Lesbia'; lost only brother by early death (*Poems* 65, 68); went to Bithynia in suite of provincial governor; not a politician, but impatient of Caesar and Caesarians; date of death uncertain.

If the merit of poetry were to be estimated, as it may be, simply by the poignancy of the emotion presented and conveyed, Catullus is not only the first of Latin poets, but there is no other, except perhaps Lucretius, whom we could put beside him. To combine the appearance of spontaneity with the grace of musical rhythm, hard in any language, was specially so in Latin, from causes partly inherent in the material,—a not copious vocabulary and a not flexible syntax,—partly attributable to the foreign origin of the metrical forms. Of this latter aspect, the technical difficulties of Roman lyric, we are not now to speak<sup>1</sup>. Assuming them, we have to note that, in Catullus, intensity of egoistic feeling,—this is the appearance of the matter, and perhaps the truth,—achieves, for once, the feat of making the Roman speech, though naturally stiff, reserved, and somewhat pompous, when shaped into song according to extraneous and embarrassing rules, seem nevertheless to arise instinctively out of the individual mind, and to take, without resistance, the exact pitch and shade of momentary and fugitive emotion. The effect is in proportion

<sup>1</sup> See 'Metre' *infra*.

to the surprise, of which every reader is conscious, whether or not he perceives the ground and cause of it. Even to the subtlest and least definable of mental states Catullus can give forcible expression and artistic form. For example, that vague sense of loneliness and discomfort, which makes us say to ourselves that 'we want to be talked to', is familiar at times to most people; but it seems not apt, to say the least, for the permanent record of poetry. Yet Catullus arrests and fixes it exactly, happily, and apparently without an effort:—

'Male est, Cornifici, tuo Catullo,  
male est me hercule et est laboriose,  
et magis magis in dies et horas.  
Quem tu, quod minimum facillimumque est,  
qua solatus es adlocutione?  
Trascor tibi. Sic meos amores?  
Paulum quid lubet adlocutionis,  
maestius lacrimis Simonideis' (38).

When this touch is applied to passions or situations in themselves naturally impressive, the effect is such as to make almost any other poetry seem somewhat false and unreal:—

'Odi et amo. Quare id faciam fortasse requiris.  
Nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior' (85).

Little indeed in the vast poetry of happy love can compare in the simple impress of reality with the *Acme and Septimius*:—

'Nunc ab auspicio bono profecti  
mutuis animis amant amantur:  
unam Septimius misellus Acmen  
mauolt quam Syrias Britanniasque...' (45),

or with the happier scenes of the poet's own love story, such as the 'Sparrow' (3) and the *Vivamus, mea Lesbia* (5)<sup>1</sup>. But even these are surpassed by the poems of misery (8, 11, 60, 76, etc.), the passion of which, even to contemplate, is scarcely tolerable. See especially *Poem 76*, a prayer for rest and peace of mind:—

'O di, si uestrum est misereri, aut si quibus umquam  
extremam iam ipsa in morte tulistis opem,  
me miserum aspice et, si uitam puriter egi,  
eripite hanc pestem pernicipemque mihi...  
Ipse ualere opto et taetrum hunc deponere morbum.  
O di, reddite mi hoc pro pietate mea'.

Let us note in this case, what the analysis of Catullus will illustrate everywhere, that the force depends on the strain between the natural phrasing and the technical form, on such obvious facts as that the first pentameter and the third nearly break to pieces (*in-morte, mi hoc*). To say this is

<sup>1</sup> The identification (not undisputed) of Lesbia with Clodia, the enemy of Cicero, is, in any case, not essential to the poetry.



not to defend every violence in Catullus; but it is none the less true that, when such audacities had been discarded, Latin verse, regimented by Greek, became an instrument not very large in compass.

918. The humour of Catullus, like his pathos, is distinguished by an exquisitely genuine and natural flavour. His jests indeed, his formal wit, apart from all question of moral taste, are little to be commended; but no one else has so successfully embodied in art the jets of caprice and petulance and spleen. See for example *Poem 14*,—to a friend who had sent him a volume of mediocre poetry,—*Poems 36, 40, 42, 44*, and many others.

'Nil nimium studeo, Caesar, tibi uelle placere,  
nec scire utrum sis albus an ater homo' (93).—

Such impertinences are spoken daily, but if written, not preserved. Yet this has been kept, and we do not wonder.

919. In a few cases, only too rare, this unparalleled strength of expression has been given to feelings perfectly felicitous, pure, and universally human. The poems of home-coming (4, 31, 46), connected with the return of the author from Asia, are especially delightful. Space only forbids quotation.

One theme only, as it would seem, had power to distract Catullus from himself. To marriage, directly or indirectly, relates all the valuable part of his extant work, which is not strictly personal. There are two Marriage-songs (*Epithalamia*, 61 and 62), perhaps unrivalled in their kind. In the miniature epic on the marriage of Peleus and Thetis (64) the main subject is contrasted, by the device of describing a certain tapestry, with that of Ariadne deserted by Theseus. The piece is full, almost too full, of beauties; but the narrative form is not quite congenial, and the total effect a little flat. The *Hair of Berenice*, a translation from the Alexandrian Callimachus (66), throws off thoroughly its stiffness and lethargy, when, in the conclusion, the dedicated and deified tress of the Egyptian queen invokes a blessing upon all happy marriages. From the same source of feeling comes the inspiration of the astonishing and indescribable *Attis* (63), and of the lovely *Hymn to Diana* for boys and girls (34). A comparison of this last with the similar hymn of Horace (*Ode*, i 21), though unfair to the later poet, whose strength lies elsewhere, will illustrate better than anything the heart and essence of Catullus.

920. The attraction of the Romans to the melodious Greek poetry of the Alexandrians (Theocritus, Apollonius Rhodius, Callimachus, and others), which we have just seen in Catullus, foreshows the momentous change in art, which is indicated by the name 'Augustan'. Sonority, and the love of sound-effects, distinguish Latin verse from the first, as we noted in speaking of the founder, Ennius (§ 903). Study and practice revealed that here, in the strict finish and elaboration of music, lay the field in which the Romans might best rival, and even surpass, their Greek teachers. The

'Augustan'  
poetry.

demand for continuous perfection in expressive melody, and the tendency to treat this, rather than the thought or feeling, as the essence of poetry, is the novelty which becomes conspicuous in the transition to the Empire. The change would probably have come of itself, so to say, by the natural bias of Italian taste. But it was precipitated and confirmed by what we must call the accident, that just at this moment Italy produced two men supreme in this especial faculty, the moulding of measure, the treatment of language as tune,—Virgil and Horace. If, in the latter case, as seems probable, the faculty was acquired by patient ambition rather than innate, this did not affect the achievement. The poetry produced by these two, and those whom they led, if estimated by appeal to the ear, may defy competition.

Manifestly there was danger in this position, the danger of making dexterity a substitute for sense and purpose. It may be detected possibly in the *Bucolics* of Virgil, and in the *Odes* of Horace, and it was illustrated only too fully in the sequel. But in the age now before us, the age of the political revolution, poetry was secured against inanity by the vivid and tragic interest of the time. The agony of the Civil Wars, the imminent dissolution of society and loss of all the long Roman work of civilisation and State-building, just when its full possibilities had become apparent, the dubious respites and recurrent peril, and finally the golden hopes, not altogether illusory, which saluted the establishment of the imperial peace: all that is implied in the

‘altera iam teritur bellis ciuilibus aetas,  
suis et ipsa Roma uiribus ruit’<sup>1</sup>—

the generation which passed through this crisis of human history had, and has for us, an interest almost unique.

If the magnificent literature so inspired, the central literature of Europe, is less loved than it has been, less than in a near past, this is due in some degree to the neglect of recitation (indispensable instrument of Latin poetry) in favour of silent reading.

‘Tenuit nostras numerosus Horatius aures’<sup>2</sup>.

The Augustan poetry will hold the mind and feelings only if admitted to the ear, which (for most of us) must be by study through the voice. To have mastered *vocally* a single passage of Virgil, will do more for us than much explanation. Take for example, in the *Aeneid*, the breaking of the sword of Turnus, when it meets the divine armour of Aeneas, a concentrated symbol of the whole story—energy expended in vain, because against the will of heaven:—

‘idque diu, dum terga dabant palantia Teucri,  
suffecit; postquam arma dei ad Volcania uentum est,  
mortalis mucro, glacies ceu futilis, ictu  
dissiluit:—fulua resplendent framina harena’<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Hor. *Epod.* xvi.

<sup>2</sup> Ovid, *Tristia*, iv 10, 49.

<sup>3</sup> *Aen.* xii 738 f.

Ascertain, *by vocal practice*, the effect of the alliterations, of the irregular division in the second line<sup>1</sup>, of emphatic position and contrasted rhythm in *sufficit...dissiluit*, of the break or catch of the voice, compelled by the peculiar elision, in *fragmina harena*. Or, in this description of vast horizons,—

'saepe diem noctemque et totum ex ordine mensem  
pascitur itque pecus longa in deserta sine ullis  
hospitiis.—tantum campi iacet.—omnia secum  
armentarius Afer agit, tectumque Laremque,  
armaque Amyclaeumque canem Cressamque pharetram'<sup>2</sup>—

elicit, by practice, the effect of the complicated echoes. These observations do not exhaust even the present passages; but, let the ear be awakened, and the poet will do the rest.

921. P. Vergilius Maro: born 70 B.C., at Andes near Mantua, where his father farmed small property; no occupation except learning and literature; protected against confiscation and recommended to Octavianus (Augustus) by Pollio Virgil. (? see *Eclogues* i, iv, x) about 41 B.C.; *Bucolics* or *Eclogues*, 41—37? B.C.; friendship with Maecenas, by whom he was much enriched; *Georgics* (37—30? B.C.); *Aeneid* occupied rest of life, left (in his judgment) unfinished, but published by friends; died, on return from travel in Greece, 19 B.C.

922. In the *Bucolics* or *Eclogues*, it must be admitted, the affection of Virgil for the melody of Theocritus, suggesting the attempt to translate him into something significant for Virgil's own *Eclogues.* age, has produced a perilous medley. The rustic idylls of Theocritus represented idealised Sicilians, but Virgil's scene has no reality whatever. In the fifth *Eclogue*, for example, amid Greek dances and Italian deities, the dead and deified shepherd Daphnis is lamented by the lions of Africa, and teaches them the religion of the Asiatic Bacchus. Confusion is confounded by allegory. Virgil himself is a principal shepherd. The 'Menalcas' of *Eclogue* v (86—87) claims the authorship of *Eclogues* ii and iii, and it is thus suggested that the deified Daphnis of *Eclogue* v has also a counterpart, the recently deified Iulius Caesar,—'guardian of a fair flock, himself more fair'. The flock are the Roman people, or rather mankind, seen in prophetic vision as peacefully and religiously united under the protection of imperial Rome. This vision inspires also *Eclogue* iv. It is even, in a certain sense, the postulate and foundation of the whole pastoral series, and, so far, justifies the unreality of treatment, which, in all the poems, is not only admitted but sought. We cannot feel the symbolism as it appealed to contemporaries; but the music—

'ipsi laetitia voces ad sidera iactant  
intonsi montes'<sup>3</sup>—

comes to us even enriched by the echoes of two thousand years.

<sup>1</sup> On the Virgilian treatment of caesura, cp. 'Metre' *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> *Georg.* iii 341 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Ecl.* v 62.

923. The *Georgics* were also based on Greek models, but the application was much happier, and the product essentially new.

*Georgics.*

In primitive Greek literature (Hesiod) practical precepts, among them those of agriculture, were put into verse as the only existing form of permanent record. Following this precedent the learned composers of later times, in search of subjects, versified various sciences. The poems of Aratus (c. 270 B.C.) on 'Prognostics of Weather' (*Phaenomena* and *Diosemeia*) had been translated by Cicero. These and other lost works supplied the materials to Virgil's exposition of farming in four parts,—corn-culture etc., vine-culture, cattle-breeding, and bee-keeping. The actual conditions of Italy gave a pretext for the work, which is dedicated to the imperial minister, Maecenas, and professes to be officially inspired. But the 'didactic' purpose is a mere form; the essence is visionary and symbolic. The painful, yet hopeful, destiny of man, placed in a world which he must subdue by hard toil to his need, and which yet is mysteriously sympathetic with his success<sup>1</sup>,—such is the real theme of this 'glorification of labour.' The shadow of the Civil Wars<sup>2</sup> is behind, and over the better prospect presides the glorious and beneficent figure of Caesar, prince and god<sup>3</sup>.—At the conclusion<sup>4</sup>, an excuse is made for relating the story of Orpheus and Eurydice. This postscript shows the melody of Virgil in perfection, and also a narrative power which promises the achievement of the *Aeneid*.

Here the destiny of Rome, consummated and inaugurated anew by the establishment of the imperial world-state, becomes the

*Aeneid.*

direct theme of a story half-romantic, half-religious. The legend, fixed by Ennius, that the State was founded by the Trojan Aeneas, seeking a destined home in Italy after the fall of Troy, made an opening for the use of the *Iliad* and all the cycle of poems with which it was connected. Ennius and others supplied Latin materials. The taking of Troy, the wanderings of the hero between Troy and Italy, his wars there, the winning of his Latian bride, the defeat and death of his rival Turnus,—this is the outline. The interference of Juno, relentless enemy of the Trojans, who endeavours to divert the destined empire to her city of Carthage, by ensnaring the prince into a union with Queen Dido, produces an episode deeply impressive both as symbol and as tragedy. The woman is sacrificed to destiny and duty. But most distinctive, and most essentially Virgilian, is the conception embodied in Book vi, where the heaven-commissioned founder of the Empire, that is to say, of the frame in which all humanity is to be at last happily united, is consecrated and heartened for his task by a revelation of the things invisible. Aeneas, having proved his mission by gathering the mystic bough which procures admittance to the realms of death, is conducted by the prophetic Sibyl through the habitation of souls, and sees the Romans that are to come. Similar in

<sup>1</sup> *Georg.* i 121—146, and *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> i 24 f.

<sup>3</sup> i 489 f.

<sup>4</sup> iv 281.



spirit is the investiture of the hero with a divine armour, the gift of gods, upon which, by superhuman art, the imperial consequences of his enterprise are actually portrayed. The material of these episodes is quarried from Homer and other literary mines, but their relation to the story, their religious significance, is original. It is interesting to note that the journey to the underworld is not only the key-stone of the *Aeneid*, but furnishes the hint and foundation for Dante's *Divina Commedia*<sup>1</sup>, in which the Roman Empire is exhibited as the frame of the Christian Church. Book II (the taking of Troy) and Book XII (the last struggle of Turnus) are splendid pieces of narrative, and Book IX (Nisus and Euryalus) a pathetic romance of chivalrous friendship. The funeral-games of Book V are a not very happy concession to Homeric precedent; but, on the whole, the selection of topics is worthy of the style, and the music of the verse is unfailing.

924. Q. Horatius Flaccus: born 65 B.C. near Venusia; father a freedman; educated at Rome, and further in Athens; received commission as tribune in army of the 'regicide' Brutus; fought at Philippi (42 B.C.); lost property, obtained post in treasury, wrote for money (early work perhaps represented partly by *Epodes* and some of the 'satires'); introduced by Virgil to Maecenas, whose friendship (about 39 B.C.) and liberality restored his fortunes (about 33 B.C. ?); *Sermones* and *Epodes* completed by 29 B.C.; *Odes*, composed slowly between 35 (?) and 21 (?) B.C., collected about latter date in *Books I—III*; *Book I of Epistles*, 20 (?) B.C.; *Carmen Saeculare*, 17 B.C.; *Book IV of Odes*, by command of Augustus, about 14—12 B.C.; *Book II of Epistles* and *Ars Poëtica* in last years; deaths of Maecenas and of Horace 8 B.C. Horace.

The work of Horace falls into two very different parts. We will speak first of his hexameters, in which he professes to follow the lead of Lucilius<sup>2</sup>.—The metaphorical description of books as 'friends' and 'companions' is, in the case of some books, more than a metaphor. Certain writers have such an art of self-revelation, of conversing, as it were, with the reader upon their personal tastes and interests, that we seem to become their intimates, and to enjoy in their company the same sense of repose and refreshment, which we derive from the talk of any person with whom we are very familiar, a pleasure almost independent of the topic. Not a few have been able so to influence their contemporaries. A few—Addison and Charles Lamb are conspicuous examples in English—have had the power to make friends in after ages. The charm of Horace has been tried so long, that it may perhaps be supposed inexhaustible. The secret of this humanity we shall not pretend to analyse; but a delicate and humorous sympathy for the common difficulties of life, a shrewd but kindly observation of common weaknesses, and a manly and cheering faculty for 'making the best of it', seem to be among the efficient elements in such a character. According to Horace (*Sat.* ii 130 f), the easy geniality of Lucilius had a fascination of this sort, attracting interest by bestowing confidence. To improve upon Lucilius by better workmanship, to adapt

<sup>1</sup> See *Inferno* Canto i and ii.

<sup>2</sup> *Supra* § 913.

his method to the requirements of a more critical age, remained (says Horace) a task and place unoccupied in the field of literature (*Sat.* i 10 46). Such, as he gives it, was the origin of the *Sermones* or 'Conversations'. The title belongs to two particular books

*Sermones.*

or collections, but it is applicable in sense to all the work of Horace, except his lyrics. (The *Sermones* are also called 'satires', but the word is unfit, in the sense which it now bears, as there is little invective or bitterness.) How Horace went into the country to work, and, being lazy, did not, and was scolded by a would-be philosopher (ii 3); how he first made acquaintance with his patron Maecenas, and the gossip about it (ii 6); how he discussed the problem of self-improvement with his manservant or his bailiff (ii 7, *Epist.* i 14); how he got rid of a bore (i 9); the tale of a journey or a dinner (i 5, ii 8):—such is the matter. The charm of it each reader will find for himself. The form of

*Epistolae.*

the so-called 'Letters' (*Epistolae*) is not really distinctive, except in one letter (*Epist.* i 9) introducing a friend, who was going to the East, to the prince who was afterwards the Emperor Tiberius. This little masterpiece of thirteen lines may perhaps best serve to show why, if not how, Horace has become the friend of the world. The two 'Letters' which compose Book II (one of them addressed to Augustus) are a farewell to literature, reviewing its position and prospects. Out of another

*Ars Poëtica.*

grew a loose and informal treatise on the rules of dramatic art (*Ars Poëtica*), compiled from Greek sources. Like all the work of Horace, it is full of neat, though commonplace, points. An interesting feature in these critical reviews is the evidently genuine expectation of Horace that (after the achievement of Virgil) there should and would come a parallel achievement in tragedy,—a Roman Sophocles. The expectation was natural, though it was not accomplished.

This body of work—unpretentious in form, though exquisite in technical execution—is perhaps the most valuable part of his legacy, but not the ground of his fame, which rests, where he bases it, upon the *Odes*. His

*Epodes.*

early attempts in the satirical species of Greek lyric (the *Epodes*) are not now very interesting; but *Epode* 15 (the complaint of a deserted lover) displays in its opening (1—10) the full perfection of his melody; and *Epode* 16, a prophetic meditation on the yearning of a war-weary world for peace and repose, comes as near, as art and eloquence may, to the mysterious inspiration of Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue*. The sentiment of this Epode, varied and modified by successive phases in the passage from the agitation of the Civil Wars to the security of the Empire, is the basis of the magnificent series of political poems,

*Odes.*

which runs through the first *Three Books* of the *Odes* (the original collection) and makes a historical framework for the rest:—Rome, all but destroyed for her sins (*Ode*, i 2) may yet recover, by repentance and self-discipline, under the guidance of the Augustus, the 'praesens diuus', the champion and representative of the divine will (see

especially *Odes* iii 1—6). The other poems are, many of them, ostensibly connected with the personal relations of the author,—his reflexions upon the peril of a friend at sea (i 3), the Arcadian felicity of his Sabine farm (i 17, i 22), his literary ambition (i 32), his narrow escape from death (ii 13, iii 8), his hopes of literary immortality (ii 20, iii 30), and the like. Several testify to a sentiment undoubtedly strong and sincere, his gratitude to the patron, Maecenas, to whose liberality he was indebted for independence (i 20, ii 17, ii 18, iii 8, iii 29). But in truth the ostensible occasions are of little importance,—*for us*, to whom the persons and stories are not otherwise known. All the poems tend to fall into a common vein of graceful meditation on simple and familiar topics, the fragility of life (the principal theme of Book ii), the passing of time (i 4, i 9, i 11, and iv 7, an exquisite piece and the quintessence of the Horatian lyric), counsels of prudence, moderation, and self-restraint. The method of the artist, compared by himself (iv 2, 27) to the work of the bee, may be clearly seen even in the poems of occasion (such as i 3): a collection of epigrammatic commonplaces has been laboriously constructed, and then skilfully tacked to the particular circumstance. The poems on love especially, or rather on man and woman, avoid, for the most part, even the appearance of reality or passion; the commonplaces of the subject—coquetry (i 5, i 8, ii 8), fidelity assailed (iii 7), age affecting youth (iii 15) etc.—are contemplated from without. But almost all are admirable in their kind; the apology (i 16) and the reconciliation (iii 9) are among the best. The severe limitation of sentiment is necessarily required by the metrical fetters<sup>1</sup>, which Horace, rejecting altogether the lead of Catullus, imposed upon the verse of his Greek models. His miraculous success depends upon the tact, which attempts nothing not possible under the conditions (i 13 may be thought an exception, proving the rule), the finish which gives to every sentence and almost every phrase an independent value, and above all—the faultless melody.

925. We turn now to the elegiac poetry of the Augustan age. Here, as in the lyric of Horace, it is necessary first to comprehend the restrictions imposed by Roman criticism on the metrical freedom of the Greek couplet<sup>2</sup>. So bound, it is excellent for epigram, and capable of sweetness and dignity, but unfit for a long flight, and scarcely capable of free and energetic passion. The type was established chiefly by the poets Gallus and Tibullus. Gallus we have lost, and cannot judge.

Elegiac poets.

Tibullus (commonly identified with 'Albius' of Horace *Ode*, i 33 and *Epist.* i 4): born about 65—60 B.C.; 'eques' and well-off, even after loss of property by confiscations; attached to circle of Messalla, eminent politician and rival of Maecenas as patron of literature; poems addressed to 'Delia' and 'Nemesis', persons possibly fictitious; travelled with Messalla; died 19 B.C.

Tibullus.

Tibullus has the credit of perfecting the form, and of observing most

<sup>1</sup> Cp. 'Metre' *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.*

exactly the capacity of the instrument. His leading sentiment, the praise of peace, simplicity, and rural repose, is the sentiment of the age, inspired by the re-establishment of security and order. Tibullus represents it exactly as it might be felt by any man of taste and sensibility, without either the reality or the affectation of rapture:—

‘diuitias alius fuluo sibi congerat auro  
et teneat culti iugera multa soli,  
quem labor adsiduus uicino terreat hoste,  
Martia cui somnos classica pulsa fugent:  
me mea paupertas uita traducat inerti,  
dum meus adsiduo luceat igne focus’ (i 1, 1—6).

See the whole of this first poem, and compare i 10 in the same strain, or ii 1 (the picture of a religious holiday celebrated in the country). His poems on the sorrows of love, a theme almost imposed on the elegiac poet, as such, by literary tradition, have a less genuine ring, but their sweet and plaintive tone is that which best suits the delicate verse: see especially ii 6, which is the strongest in the appearance of real emotion. One piece (ii 5) has a public or quasi-public character. It celebrates the appointment of the son of the poet’s patron, Messalla, as one of the custodians of the sacred Sibylline books, and praises, in this connexion, the glory and security of the Empire. It has much beauty, though pomp and enthusiasm are not the sentiments most congenial to the author. In i 3, purporting to have been written, in sickness and abandonment, during an absence from home, the poet’s vein of self-pity is seen perhaps at its best.

With the certainly genuine work of Tibullus (Books i and ii) are preserved, without distinction of title, other pieces, chiefly elegiac love-poems, proceeding from the literary circle of Messalla. Those which speak in the name of ‘Lygdamus’ are similar though mostly inferior to the work of Tibullus. Those of Sulpicia. the lady Sulpicia have an energy which does not belong to him, and are extremely interesting as evidence of Roman taste and culture.

926. **Sextus Propertius**: born, probably not later than 50 B.C., in Umbria (near Assisi); apparently independent, in spite of decline of family by losses (confiscation?); attached to literary circle of Maecenas, probably after publication of first book (see below); work produced about 30—20 B.C.?; married (?) towards latter date (Poems iii 19 and 20), to Hostia (?), identical (?) with the ‘Cynthia’ of the Poems; died probably not much later.

Propertius, according to Roman judgment as represented by the critic Quintilian (x 1, 93), counted as second, or perhaps equal, to Tibullus. On technical grounds this judgment may be sustained, but in power and range of feelings, and in moral interest, the superiority of Propertius cannot be contested. He declares himself an imitator of the Alexandrian elegiac poets, especially of Callimachus; but, whatever he may have borrowed, the claim of a relative originality, which (like the Augustan poets generally) he nevertheless advances, is in no case better justified. If such poems



as iv 7 (in which he is visited in sleep by the apparition of his forsaken mistress and receives the account of her tragic death), and iv 8 (which narrates how he sought distraction from her jealousy, and was surprised by her in forbidden company),—if these resembled any Greek model, they are none the less essentially native, the manners taken from real Roman life, the feelings free, energetic, and personal. A new path was here opened to Roman literature.

The works of Propertius have unhappily suffered from loss and other injury. They now consist, and perhaps always consisted, of four Books, three of which appear to have been arranged by himself, while the fourth is a posthumous collection. The last contains (*inter alia*) a noble consolatory elegy (iv 11) spoken in the person of a departed wife to her husband and children, and several pieces destined for a promised work on the legends of Rome: the story of Tarpeia (iv 4) is a fine specimen.

Books i—iii are occupied mainly, and almost entirely, with a single subject, an unhappy love-story—the beginning, progress, and end of an irregular union between the narrator (the poet himself) and a woman called 'Cynthia'. The title *Cynthia* belonged originally to Book i as a separate publication (*Cynthia monobiblos*—'in one book'), but should apparently be extended also to the whole three. Though the successive pieces are independent (generally speaking), and are not linked into a narrative, the intention to represent successive phases of feeling is obvious, and would doubtless be much more so, if we had the whole and could restore the portions disturbed. As ultimately developed, the tale is a satire both on the hero and on the heroine, a bitter warning against the perils and miseries of such a connexion. Both parties are faithless, jealous, and exacting. The point of view throughout is of course that of the man. A brief period of illusion and ecstasy (Book i) is followed by years of irritation, humiliation, and self-reproach, spaced here and there by calms and truces; and finally the slave of passion, after trying in vain other distractions, such as drink and (perhaps) marriage, is supposed to emancipate himself by foreign travel, and dismisses the dethroned idol with a stern farewell.

Two of the poems deal with public events, the dedication of the Palatine temple (ii 31) and the death of the young Marcellus (iii 18), and mark the period, ending about B.C. 23, in which the story is supposed to pass. The servitude of the lover lasts for five years (iii 25, 3). How far the experiences are real, we do not know, nor is it material. A tradition, perhaps conjectural, identified 'Cynthia' with Hostia, a lady of good family and position. But the internal evidence is absolutely against this, unless the person, whom Propertius marries, or proposes to marry, in iii 20 (or 19 and 20), is Cynthia. The question is of great importance to the colour of the story, but cannot here be discussed.

The conversion of the story, by the addition of the later books, into a moral lesson, suitable for the reformatory programme of the imperial

government, is presumably not unconnected with the official patronage extended to the author by Maecenas (ii 1, iii 9, etc.). From time to time the nobler feelings of the lover, patriotism and glimpses of public duty, are represented as struggling against the dominant attachment. Among the products of these higher moments, we may note especially the impressive declamation upon the ambition and fall of Cleopatra (iii 11), and the meditation on the prospect of a triumph over the Parthians (iii 4).

But all this element is subordinate to the main theme, the picture of a violent and imperious passion in its various moods, the evanescent beauty and glory, the disenchantment and agony; the abasement, weariness, and disgust. Tastes will differ in the appreciation of such work; but, in its kind, it is extremely powerful. The beauty fills most of Book i (see especially the day-dreams of i 14 and i 18) and culminates perhaps in the nocturnal vision of Cynthia drowning (ii 26):—

‘Vidi te in somnis fracta, mea uita, carina  
 Ionio lassas ducere rore manus,  
 et quaecumque in me fueras mentita fateri,  
 nec iam umore graves tollere posse comas...’,

and in the episode (ii 27 and 28) ‘Cynthia in danger of death’. Here is part of the poem on her recovery:—

‘Haec tua, Persephone, maneat clementia, nec tu,  
 Persephonaë coniunx, saeuior esse uelis.  
 sunt apud infernos tot milia formosarum:  
 pulchra sit in superis, si licet, una locis.  
 uobiscum est Iope, uobiscum candida Tyro,  
 uobiscum Europe nec proba Pasiphaë...  
 et quaecumque erat in numero Romana puella,  
 occidit: has omnes ignis auarus habet...’.

The other side, the misery and the degradation, is written everywhere, and may be summed in the striking couplet (ii 23, 1):—

‘cui fugienda fuit indocti semita uolgi,  
 ipsa petita lacu nunc mihi dulcis aqua est’.

This vein of sentiment and moral feeling is no longer, as it was then, new; but, after much imitation, it has still a special force and freshness in the work of the original inventor.

927. Of the three verse-forms thus technically perfected, the hexameter, couplet, and lyric, the last did not prove fertile; on the peculiar instrument of Horace, he only could perform with success. The others passed into the hands of Ovid.

Publius Ovidius Naso: born at Sulmo 43 B.C.; ‘eques’ and wealthy; after travels in Greece and Asia, settled in Rome about 20 B.C.; commenced public and forensic life, but not seriously; lived in and for society; first publication (elegiac) about 13 B.C.; *Amores*, *Hērōides*, *Medea* (tragedy), *De Arte*

Ovid.

*Amatoria*, and other works, 13—1 B.C.; *Metamorphōses* and *Fasti*, 1—7 A.D.; exiled by Augustus, without reason assigned, to Tomi on the Euxine, 7—8 A.D.; wrote there *Tristia*, *Epistles from Pontus*, *Halieutica* and other works; died in exile 17 A.D.

Close as Ovid is in time to the earlier Augustans, though he saw Virgil, was intimate with Propertius, and was famous before the death of Horace, and although, in a technical aspect, his art is a legitimate development of the Augustan canons, Ovid is in spirit utterly different; and his accession to the leadership in literature marks a profound alteration of sentiment. Roman society, relieved from the fears, and inevitably disappointed of some hopes, which had been excited by the great revolution, desired chiefly to be entertained and amused; or, at all events, it is to this desire, and to this only, that the favourite poet responds.

For this limited purpose, nothing serves so well as the short story, having just enough reality to engage a passing interest, and enough unreality to leave undisturbed both the feelings and the intellect. The *Metamorphōses*, a work of unique importance in the general history of European art, is a vast collection of such stories (fifteen long Books of hexameter verse) gathered from Greek mythology, and linked together by skilful transitions in such a way that, wherever you open, it is easy to find a convenient beginning and a not distant end. For the most part, there is in each legend, as indicated by the title, some miraculous 'transformation', such as that of the fugitive Daphne into a bay-tree. This trait is often a mere excuse for including the legend; but the note of fantasy, running through the whole, serves to sustain the lightness of touch, to preserve alike from gravity and from bitterness the pathos or the humour of the tales. This principle being assumed, the performance exceeds commendation. The legends of Niobe (vi 146), of Philomela (vi 424), of Phaëthon (i 755), of Pyramus and Thisbe (iv 55), and all the rest, completely fill with easy and pleasant occupation the time which it takes to read them. Effect beyond that, in the way of reflexion, emotion, speculation, is not only not sought, but carefully barred, as a peril to pleasure. This achievement, as a feat of art, is sometimes not less wonderful than any of the 'transformations' described. Nothing resists the solvent of Ovid's secure elegance. For example:—King Pentheus (it was told) resisted the new religion of Bacchus; his mother and other women, frenzied by Bacchus, tore the unbeliever to pieces with their own hands. This ghastly picture of fanaticism was embodied by Euripides in a tragedy fierce and enigmatical as the legend itself. Philosophy had invested it with an allegorical interpretation of profound pathos<sup>1</sup>. In the Roman empire, and in the age of Ovid, the Bacchic religion, under various forms, was fully alive, and was exhibiting symptoms both hopeful and alarming. But Ovid<sup>2</sup> carries us through the story of Pentheus without a throb or a question, exploits Euripides and other material with calm dexterity, and

<sup>1</sup> Horace, *Epist.* i 16, 73—79.

<sup>2</sup> *Met.* iii 511.

dismisses the theological import of the mystery—a matter of almost incomparable significance in the religious history of Europe—with the just perceptible sneer of perfect politeness<sup>1</sup> :—

‘...Bacchumque vocant, Bromiumque, Lyaeumque,  
ignigenamque, satumque iterum, solumque bimatrem...  
et quae praeterea per Graias plurima gentes  
nomina, Liber, habes’.

As introduction to the work, we have a sketch of the history of creation, and the ‘transformation’ of Chaos into Order. Here the entire universe, including humanity and all its possibilities, is exhibited for our contemplation with the same sort of pleased but neutral interest, which is afterwards bestowed on every variety of human incident. The problem of our origin and constitution, of the relation between body and soul, is ushered in and bowed out again with the same imperturbable content :—

‘natus homo est,—siue hunc diuino semine fecit  
ille opifex rerum, mundi melioris origo,  
siue recens tellus seductaque nuper ab alto  
aethere cognati retinebat semina caeli’<sup>2</sup>.

In this way the *Metamorphōses* attains the maximum in that species of pleasure which shuns the admixture of pain. So long as Latin was the staple of reading, it was perhaps the most familiar of books, and from it is derived, directly or indirectly, a large part of the stories and figures which form the common stock of European art.

The *elegiac* work of Ovid is similar in success and limitations, but has one special defect. His light hexameter<sup>3</sup> retains variety sufficient for his purpose; but the Augustan couplet becomes, under his treatment, more monotonous than ever, and is nevertheless repeated without mercy. The *Ars Amatoria*, in chapters of 700 and 800 verses, is open to objections altogether independent of morals.

The *Hērōidēs* are variations on the theme of deserted woman<sup>4</sup>, imaginary letters from Dido to Aeneas, Oenone to Paris, Penelope to Ulysses, and so on. They are vigorous, pretty, and not immoderate in dimension; but the very conception of such a series, such repetition of the same motive, implies the perfect detachment of feeling, the facile appeal to an indolent intelligence, which is the note of Ovidian art. They are in fact exercises in rhetoric, executed with apparent ease under conditions of difficulty,—performances merely, but as such admirable.

Of such art, the very substance is appropriate ornament; and where that is sufficient, the success is complete. The elegy on Tibullus (*Amores*, iii 9) has in the highest degree the sort of beauty which may be required

<sup>1</sup> *Met.* iv 11.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* i 78.

<sup>3</sup> See ‘Metre’ *infra*.

<sup>4</sup> Following Propertius iv 3, and probably also Greek models.



in a public monument; and this poem may represent the Ovidian couplet at its best.

Poetry of passion is, upon such terms, impossible, nor does Ovid attempt it. Love, as intrigue and amusement, is for him a topic, like any other,—his own supposed adventures, no less than those of his 'Heroines'. 'An invitation refused' (*Amores*, i 12) is an unexceptionable specimen; the elegy on 'Her parrot' (ii 6), which, by reminding us of Catullus, approaches without touching the confines of parody, is perhaps for this reason the most pleasing. Comparison with Propertius is everywhere challenged by this frankest of imitators; but the resemblance is purely external. *Amores*, ii 12 and ii 13, 'Corinna in danger of death', recall the parallel episode of Propertius (ii 27 and 28) in almost every couplet. The difference is just this: that Propertius speaks *from* the situation, and Ovid *about* it.

The poem on the Roman Calendar (*Fasti*), complete for one half of the year, contains some legends very happily told; but its plan is not fortunate, and it can hardly be counted as poetry.

The huge scrolls of lament and entreaty written in exile (*Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*) might fairly decline criticism, though in fact few will perceive in them any defect of execution. But dreariness is an ill subject for decoration.

Ovid may be extolled or depreciated with equal reason. He reaches perfection, of a sort, by renouncing all the higher purposes and dignities of art. From what he says of his banishment, it would appear that his mere attitude, his tone and bearing, the turn which he gave to letters and the manner in which he employed his faculties, provoked, without definite offence, a certain frenzy of impatience in those who were responsible for the very critical condition of the world. If this be so, their injustice is not inexplicable.

He stands on a boundary, a consummation and a point of departure. Augustan at once and Post-Augustan, he completes the elaboration of an art and signalizes the need of new interests. To teach the art and to find the interests were the task and problem for the imperial age.

## B. POST-AUGUSTAN POETRY.

928. M. Mānilius, a writer of uncertain date. His style suggests the times of Augustus and Tiberius: there is a reference to the Varus disaster of 9 A.D., and several to the deification of Augustus (which can hardly have been written before the emperor's death).

We owe the *Astronomica* solely to the discoveries of Poggio. The first book is astronomical, the other four are concerned with astrology; the work is not complete. Manilius has the Roman gift of forcible brevity (cp. ii 11, *unius fecunda bonis*, of posterity's borrowings from Homer; *ib.* 58

*nec furtum sed opus ueniet*, in reference to the originality of his own book) and some fine lines (e.g. i 703 f, *namque in caeruleo candens nitet orbita mundo | ceu missura diem subito caelumque recludens*, of the milky way, and v 60, *ementita diem nigras nox contrahat alas*, of the brightness of night when Orion is up); but his claims to poetic genius are of the slightest. The Andromeda episode (v 540 ff) is obviously intended as a show-piece, but is a poor mixture of childish rhetoric and utter commonplace. The description of the gaoler in v 621 ff is simply bad versifying of the famous description in Cicero's *Fifth Verrine*. At his best, Manilius may remind us of Lucretius, but the language is too often inexcusably crabbed, and the metre has the regular and monotonous flow of the age. The oases are: (1) the prefaces, and some digressions in which we recognise the tone of the Stoic diatribe (cp. iv 387 ff, 866 ff), (2) the illustrations from daily life etc. (a child's reading lesson ii 755 ff, tunny fishing v 664 ff), (3) the descriptions of characters and types (shorthand writer iv 197 ff, fops v 146 ff, expert swimmers v 423 ff), and (4) the geographical excursus in iv 595 ff, in which, after a tour round the coasts of the Mediterranean, we have an account of the other Ocean-bays, the three continents, and certain characteristics of the several nations.

929. 'Phaedrus, Augusti Libertus' (so MSS), born, according to his own (apparently seriously meant) statement, near Pieria. He was prosecuted by Seianus,

Phaedrus. probably in connexion with some of his fables and apparently with success. He flourished under Tiberius and Caligula in 30—40 A.D.

The writing out of Aesop's fables was regularly practised by boys about to leave the *grammaticus* for the *rhetor*. *Risum mouet, uitam monet* says the author of his book. To a nucleus of fables bearing the name of Aesop he has added others of like tendency (*quas Aesopias, non Aesopi nomino*), apophthegms and early counterparts of the French *contes* or Poggio's *facetiae*. There are five Books, each having a prologue, three an epilogue in verse, addressed to reader or patron; in the fourth Book similar poems are interspersed with the fables. We may have lost much of the work; two books are much shorter than the others, and some very Phaedrian tales are found in the Perotti collection of the fifteenth century (c. 1450). The Thracian's Latin is wonderfully pure. His taste for brevity and point is tempered with discretion. There are some silver-age usages, and much concrete use of abstract nouns (*maiestas ducis*, 'His Majesty'). The style is unassuming, save for occasional mock-heroics (*alui tartareo specu*), and is yet forcible, especially in satiric passages which are common and sometimes rather damage the effect of the moral. *Exemplum cgregium prorsus et laudabile—Verum est audivit diues, et pauper pudor*. The iambic metre is of the archaic kind, allowing spondees in the even feet: a line like *Aesopi statuam ingentem posuere Attici* is very near becoming a hexameter.

Martial's Phaedrus (iii 20, 5) is probably the fabulist. Avianus mentions him, and a prose paraphrase, of about the same date (cent. iv—v), seems to have been used in two mediaeval collections of fables.

L. Annaeus Seneca: see, for his life, § 991 *infra*.

Seneca.

930. In Seneca the sublimity and sententiousness of old Roman drama degenerate into mannerism and epigram. Probably Ovid was responsible for the decline: one of the two extant lines of his *Medea* is very Senecan. The scenes in such plays must have resembled the mock trials of the schools. The lawsuit was academic, the tragedy mainly literary. Unnatural love or hate, frenzy, adultery, ruthlessness, are the themes of declamation and drama alike. Latro trained his pupils to make Atreus and Thyestes in the play the models for their oft-recurring *fratres dissidentes*; the Senecan tragedy reproduces not merely the style of the declamations (antithesis, paradox, word-play) but their proudest jewels. 'To stay a miserable man from suicide is murder'; 'Parents love best their less fortunate children'; 'If your body must pay all the penalties you owe, you are bankrupt'. The choruses are simply diatribes on Stoic common-places, the *loci philosophum* which many declaimers affected. And, in general, the plays owe more to Ovid than to Sophocles or even Euripides. Character-drawing there is none, real force is rare, straining after its semblance frequent: lines like *terribile dirum pestilens atrox ferum* are common, and strong emotion is regularly represented by hysterical rant. Powerful situations are ruined by bad taste or imperfect sense of humour. The *Phaëdra* ends with a scene in which Theseus methodically pieces together the remains of Hippolytus; Thyestes, on learning what he has eaten, would beat his breast, but remembers it has become his children's tomb and refrains: *parcamus umbris!* It is true the conceit was not his own, but where was it more odious? And worse follows (999 ff). Yet, under this foul crust, lies sometimes precious metal. There is power in the picture of the march of the mighty army of the dead along the dusky road to Tartarus (*H.F.* 838 ff), pathos and delicacy in the turn given to the allusion to the custom of carrying torches at the funerals of children: *his datum solis, minus ut timerent | igne praelato releuare noctem*. The well-known scene in which Ulysses forces Andromache to reveal her doomed son's hiding-place is really dramatic; the restrained force of the *o siluæ, o ferae!*, with which Hippolytus breaks off a tirade of horror at Phaëdra's effrontery, is masterly. Careful examination of the *Hercules Oëtaeus* shows that it is only partly Seneca's work. The *Octavia* is, of course, not his at all, though it may belong to the first century after Christ, and has interest, as the only extant specimen of a Roman historical play.

931. The plays were acted, if never before, at least at the time of the Renaissance. Their influence on European drama, especially Elizabethan and French, is well known. The ghost in *Hamlet* is an evolution of the vengeful spirits that speak the prologues to the *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes*, and vanish with the break of day. Buchanan's *Jephtha* owes its existence, and much of its form and matter, to Seneca.

932. A. Persius Flaccus (34—62), born of an equestrian family at Volaterræ, pupil of Cornutus and friend of Caesius Bassus, who edited the poet's literary remains.

Persius.

Persius' work consists of a brief prologue in scazontics, in which all claim to poetic inspiration is disowned, and six Satires dealing successively with the decayed state of literature, prayer, the earnest life, self-knowledge, true freedom, and the proper use of wealth. All save the first, then, are Stoic diatribes rather than satires, the spirit that of Seneca in the *Epistles* rather than of Lucilius or Horace. One of the essentials of the old satire, dialogue, is so clumsily handled that the allotment of the speeches to their speakers is often a serious problem. The style of Persius is full of character, but he died before he could mature it. In what he left, mannerism verges into obscure pedantry and exaggeration, and the author of the famous *usque adeone | scire tuum nihil est nisi te scire hoc sciat alter?* is not unjustly himself censured by Scaliger as *ostentator febriculosae eruditionis*. The metaphors are often striking: *fibris increuit opimum | pingue*, of a hardened sinner; *quod palleat intus* 'ghastly inward paleness'; *ueteres auias* ('prejudices') *tibi de pulmone reuellam*. Yet popular words and even slang are not avoided, and scenes of everyday life are sometimes described graphically enough: see e.g. the gathering of *dilettanti* in the first, the foolish grandmother in the second, the sluggard in the third Satire. On the whole, however, Persius' knowledge of the world is gleaned from books. The *Life*, which purports to be by Probus, tells us he was of pure, reserved character, and the works bear out the statement. His debt to Horace is immense, including even the names of many of his characters. According to the *Life*, he was not attracted by the *ingenium* of Seneca. It must have been the character that he disliked, hardly the writings, which, indeed, seem to be echoed in more than one passage of the Satires.

The poet's work immediately became popular: it is referred to by Quintilian and Martial as a case where a small output conferred ample fame. The famous Probus of Berytus seems to have honoured it with a commentary; in the Middle Ages it was a school-book and is often quoted, for instance, by John of Salisbury; it is one of Montaigne's favourites, and Dryden translated the whole into English verse.

933. M. Annaeus Lucanus (39—65), born at Corduba, nephew of the philosopher Seneca. In Rome, he was at first patronised by Nero, and held a

Lucan. quaestorship and augurate. A quarrel with the emperor led to his being forbidden to publish; he joined Piso's conspiracy and on its discovery was compelled (after a shameful attempt to obtain pardon) to put an end to himself.

Lucan owes something to Virgil, but more to Porcius Latro and the other *rhetôres*. There is little to bridge the enormous gulf between *Aeneid* and *Bellum Civile*. The *Metamorphoses* do not profess to be an epic, and the fragments of Pedo and Severus, whilst they suggest Lucan's language and metre, are nevertheless too slight to give an idea of the structure of their poems.

The 'civil war' is that between Caesar and Pompey. So far from plunging *in medias res*, the first Book is introductory, and so is half the second. The other half brings us to Pompey's flight from Italy. Caesar at Rome and the siege of Massilia occupy the third Book, the war around



Ille the fourth. Books five and six describe the manœuvring in Epirus and lead up to Pharsalia, which monopolises Book seven. The last three Books narrate successively Pompey's flight and death, Cato in Africa, and Caesar at Alexandria. The poem is unfinished, ending abruptly at x 546. Probably it was to have concluded with the death of Caesar.

No ancient author has carried the love of point to such an extreme as Lucan. And often the point is ridiculous, worked to death (as in the first seven lines of the poem) or obscure (as when 'the river received water from the banks' means—'The very banks, that should the stream have held, | Now with their melting snows the waters swelled'). Another weakness of Lucan's is readiness to digress. Metellus bars the way to the treasury: we must stop to reflect that even Caesar cannot crush that strongest of passions, the love of money. A *locus* on omens suggests eleven lines on the theme, 'No boon to know the future'. Mention of the Belgae introduces a disquisition on the causes of tides, though the poet eventually disclaims any desire to know the truth. Legends strike root easily in the friendly soil of the epics, but the mere shifting of the action to Africa hardly justifies a long account of Hercules' fight with Antaeus. Lucan has no idea of concentration. It is natural that a Roman poet should wish to describe omens. Virgil had treated of those manifest signs that even the vulgar could not miss, Seneca those intelligible only to the *haruspex*. Lucan 'contaminates' the two accounts, adds an astrologer, and ends up with the prophecies of a raving matron. No wonder Scaliger branded him as *pater taedii*. As for taste, the extravagances of Ovid and Seneca are but a faint track to the high-road we now traverse. When Caesar crosses the Adriatic in a storm, the wind sweeps the waves of the Aegean into the Tuscan waters! The dust of battle is laid by the blood of the combatants, and a river, blocked by bodies, overflows its banks and 'restores the dead to the field'. In these battle-scenes, indeed, we feel that Lucan is regaling us with choice incidents from amphitheatre or *naumachia*: signs of the morbid love of the loathsome are visible elsewhere, as when the thirsty Pompeians suck the cattle dry, and then *lacte negato | sordidus exhausto sorbetur ab ubere sanguis*. Another defect, monotony of metre, is partly due to Ovid. Only partly, for although Ovid killed the music of the hexameter, he did not mangle the corpse with such lines as *Praenestina suos cunctos simul ense recisos*.

934. The mistakes are mainly those of youth, and Lucan died young. Maturity must have brought a judgment that would have greatly increased his strength. Pope tried the epic in boyhood: Lucan might, perhaps, have devoted his riper years to satire. Two virtues very necessary for the author of an epic he would never, perhaps, have acquired—the readiness to merge the poet's personality in his theme, and the power to make heroic or historic figures live. The gift of drawing a vivid picture with a few quick strokes was not beyond his reach: a few traces are found in the poem, e.g. the description of the father of Argus stumbling along the deck to help

his wounded son (iii 731 ff). Lucan's best points are a glowing patriotism that pervades the work, power to cast thoughts in the concise, forcible mould which is half the secret of the *geflügeltes Wort*, and originality. The divine machinery, inherited from Homer by Ennius, from him by Virgil, is abandoned by Lucan, whose debt indeed to predecessors (especially Virgil) is trifling compared with that of Valerius or Statius.

935. The epic writers of the next generation and Claudian found in Lucan a source of inspiration second only to that afforded by the author of the *Aeneid*. The grammarians often cite him, Quintilian calls him *sententiarum clarissimus*, referring, presumably, to his numerous points and epigrams. To these he certainly owes much of his popularity in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance. Garnier in the *Cornélie* used his seventh Book. He is the only post-Virgilian epic poet cited, with any frequency, by Montaigne in the sixteenth or the *Spectator* in the eighteenth century. Pope's 'headlong streams hang list'ning in their fall' is a curious mixture of Virgil and Lucan. Macaulay greatly admired him, considering his enumeration of Pompey's exploits and the character of Pompey put by him in the mouth of Cato as 'surpassing in eloquence anything I know in the Latin language'. To most moderns, indeed, the *Bellum Civile* represents the silver epic, a point of view not quite fair to the latter. Critics so opposite as Pope and Coleridge have ranked Statius above Lucan; Valerius is probably better than either. Much of the preference for Lucan is really preference for his subject over that of the mythological epics, but the excellence of this only brings into relief the absurdity of the manner in which he has handled it. (On Lucan, cp. Heitland's Introduction to Haskins' ed., 1887.)

**Columella.** 936. L. Iunius Moderatus Columella: see for his life § 990 *infra*.

The description of the old Corycian garden in the *Georgics* breaks off with the words *uerum haec ipse equidem spatiis exclusus iniquis | praetereo atque aliis post me memoranda relinquo*. Columella's tenth book carries out the suggestion in 436 smooth hexameters. Virgil's language is often reproduced, hardly his spirit. The dry enumerations of flowers and garden stuffs remind one of 'The Critic' and its line 'the linnet, chaffinch, bullfinch, goldfinch, greenfinch'. Attempts at point are few and feeble (as when the gold-fleeced ram is styled *Phrixus nec portitor Helles*). This negative virtue ill atones for the complete lack of poetic feeling. Once, indeed, the poet's Muse rebukes him for trying to soar, *paruoque iubet decurrere gyro | et secum gracili conectere carmina filo*. After all, his flight had not been rash, being within easy reach of a passage in the second *Georgic*.

**Calpurnius.** 937. T. Calpurnius Siculus probably wrote under Nero.

The subjects of the seven *Ecliques* are: (1) shepherds find carved on a tree a prophecy of the return of the golden age; (2) a singing match between a gardener and a shepherd; (3) a shepherd narrates the faithlessness of his mistress; (4) a shepherd (Calpurnius himself) recounts favours

received from his protector Meliboeus: an amoebaeon scene follows, in which the emperor's praise is sung; (5) an old shepherd gives a lesson on sheep-rearing; (6) a singing match is broken off by a violent quarrel between the competitors; and (7) a shepherd describes the exhibitions in the amphitheatre at Rome, with much praise of the emperor. Calpurnius has given Virgil's *Eclogues* the foil which Silius and Columella gave the *Aeneid* and *Georgics*. The metre is smooth, but, what originality there is, readily degenerates into extravagance. The bees stop gathering honey to hear Idas and Astacus sing, and a shepherd pining at the loss of a mistress says:—*non sic destricta marcescit turdus oliua*.

938. AETNA. Ascribed to Virgil in the *Appendix Vergiliana*, but probably post-Augustan. Seneca (*Ep.* 79, 5) writes to Lucilius:—*Aetnam describas in tuo carmine et hunc sollemnem omnibus poetis locum attingas*. It is now generally assumed that *Aetna* is Lucilius' reply. But (1) *locum attingas* suggests episodic treatment, and, of the three poets whom Seneca afterwards names, Virgil and Ovid certainly, Seuerus probably, *did* treat *Aetna* thus; (2) The fragments of Lucilius, scanty as they are, suggest a pointed and antithetical style, unlike that of *Aetna*. The first argument tells also against other inferences that have been drawn from the passage in Seneca: *e.g.* that Seuerus wrote *Aetna* and that is the reason why Seneca mentioned him.

939. The text of the poem (644 hexameters) is very uncertain, the style crabbed. The preface, as in Manilius and Nemesianus, scornfully rejects the hackneyed mythological themes. Then various theories as to the cause of the volcano's activity are refuted, and the author's own solution offered, stress being laid on the part played by the winds and the lava-stone. The digressions are mainly philosophical common-places, *e.g.* on the folly of travel, when nature can be contemplated at home. The poem ends with a typically prosaic account of the 'Catanean brothers' who, in an eruption, abandoned their belongings in order to carry their aged parents out of danger.

940. Gaius Valerius Flaccus Setinus Balbus (died about 90 A.D.). He was probably *XV uir sacris faciundis*. He dedicates his poem to Vespasian, and is spoken of by Quintilian as having lately died. Martial's friend Flaccus is another person.

Valerius  
Flaccus.

The *Argonautics* break off, interrupted most probably by the author's death, in the middle of the eighth Book, at the Absyrtus-episode. The simple chronological plan, and such episodes as that of Hylas and Amŷcus, with many details, Valerius owes to the Alexandrian Apollonius. But he is no mere translator. As regards thought and language, his debt to the Alexandrian is small, hardly greater than to Homer. Many of the episodes (the storm, the death of Jason's parents, the Lemnian crime, the rescue of Hēsīōnē, the fight at Colchis) are not in Apollonius at all, though Valerius was not necessarily the first to connect them with the voyage of the Argonauts. The imitation of Virgil, only discernible in Lucan, now becomes obtrusive, and though not so excessive as in Statius and Silius, already encroaches on the economy of the poem. It involves, in Valerius' case, careful study of Virgil's *technique*, with excellent results: in unity, the

Latin *Argonautics* far outshine the Greek. Jason is a real leader of men, and the episodes are interconnected by the most skilful use of motives. Still, no matter how we strive to grasp the ancient standpoint as regards the use of models, the frequency of Virgilian echoes, to say nothing of the loans from Ovid, Seneca and Lucan, cannot but wound modern ears. It may be pleaded for Valerius that, in spite of the Ovidian level of his verse, he approaches nearer than anyone else to Virgil's spirit. His rhetoric especially is, like the great Augustan's, a restrained force quite different from the blatant feebleness of the declamations. But his claims go far beyond this. The work bears the impress of original genius and poetic inspiration. In delineating Medea's passion Valerius has put in the shade Ovid's psychological skill: for a parallel to so careful and thrilling a narrative of the gradual growth of love we must turn to the great novels of modern times. His appreciation of the power which the simple and direct may wield, gives him a unique position among the poets of this century, a very high position among the Roman poets of all time. Like the emperor to whom he dedicates his poem, he revives for us the old Roman *gravitas*. Sometimes we catch the very accents of the republican age, as in the Lucretian description of the awe felt by the Argonauts, when the first night surprises them on the sea, or the Catullus-like lines that introduce the downcast, stammering *δαριεὺς* of the lovers in vii 511 ff.

941. Quintilian regards Valerius' death as a loss to literature (x 1, 90). Statius, perhaps even Tacitus, imitated passages of the *Argonautica*. The grammarians and the Middle Ages consigned it and the *Punica* to a common limbo of forgetfulness. Poggio restored both works to the light of day, but, in Valerius' case, the old school tradition dies hard, and quotations from him have always been rare. Coleridge's criticism ('pretty in parts') suggests but a nodding acquaintance. It would be hard to establish any close connexion between this poem and the *Life and Death of Jason*. But Morris's Lemnian who swims out to the Argo with his tale of the massacre of all the other males is only Virgil's Achaemënides, and this adaptation of a Virgilian episode is thoroughly Valerian. (Cp. Summers' *Study of the Argonautica*, 1894.)

942. P. Papinius Statius (c. 40—c. 96), born of a good family at Naples. He settled, probably after his father's death (about 80), in Rome, where he enjoyed considerable fame, and found a wife. In 93-4 he returned in broken health to his native city.

943. The *Thēbāis*, an epic on the theme of the 'Seven against Thebes', starts with Polynices' exile and his reception by Adrastus at

*Thebais*.

Argos, Eteocles' breach of the compact, the march of the besieging army to Thebes, the war and its climax, the fatal duel, and Theseus' intervention on behalf of the unburied. Unity is not one of Statius' idols. Valerius could hardly escape telling the story of the Lemnian crime: in Statius the incident is very loosely connected with his theme, and delays the action intolerably. True, Antimachus ran



through twenty-four books before he got his heroes to Thebes, and Statius does it in six, but we feel that preliminaries should not occupy half the work. Divine machinery is worked with energy, Acheron too is disturbed, and the ghost of Laius combines the parts of Seneca's Thyestes and Virgil's Fury. The imitation of Virgil is servile. There is a book of funeral games, Silvia's doe finds a wholly needless counterpart in the tame tigers of Thebes, a 'Nisus and Euryalus' episode frankly concludes *forsitan et comites non adspernabitur umbras* | *Euryalus Phrygiique admittet gloria Nisi*. Ovid, Seneca, and Lucan, are freely used: Statius shares with the first-named the love of allegory and personification. Yet there is an original side to our poet. He rivals Ovid in coining new words, Virgil in finding fresh meanings for old ones. Full knowledge of his audacity often enables us to keep readings of the *codex Puteaneus*, that have long yielded place to the watered-down text of the other recension. In grammar, Statius gives a wide sphere to analogy, and omits verbs with great freedom: good examples are *ab humo conari*; *inde fugam Minyae* (sc. *capunt*); *cum genitor* (sc. *adparuit*). Aposiopesis is so common that, sometimes, we find two examples in a single speech. Even in metrical matters we meet with such novelties as *tēnūā*, *ariētibus*, *imposta*: on the whole, however, Statius has aimed mainly at reproducing Virgil's hexameter, and has succeeded better than any other Latin poet. He can hardly be serious, when he explains the use of hendecasyllables in his poem on Lucan by saying, '*laudes eius dicturus hexametros meos timui*', though the hexameters of the *Silvae* certainly do not represent his metre at its best. If we compare the *Thebais* with the *Bellum Civile* in other respects, we at once note that what moralising there is, is brief, and that there are very few examples of the scientific disquisition. That of vii 808 f is certainly a bad one. But, in what the ancients called *tumor*, there is not so much difference between the two poems. Malea is 'a resting-place for weary stars'; a competitor in a chariot race 'pulls back the chariot in front of him'; *albentes nimbi* 'drop from the horses' mouths'. Like Lucan, Statius is apt to overdraw, and we cannot forgive him easily, for he can, and often does, draw a vivid picture swiftly enough. *Etiamnunc gaudia pallent* is a fine phrase for joy still tempered by the grief that went before; *omniaque excusso patuere sedilia uulgo* shows us the flash of stone-seats as the excited Circus leaps to its feet. How life-like is the picture of the child falling asleep in the meadow still clutching the grasses it has plucked; how touching that of the bird, whose nest has been robbed, wondering at the silence, and then letting fall the food that is no longer needed. Statius' similes are particularly original and attractive, yet their length is but one proof of the readiness with which he forgets the whole for the part. (Cp. Legras, *Étude sur la Thébaidé*, 1905.)

944. Of the *Achilleis* we have only some 1100 lines: Achilles' life at Scyros, his discovery by Ulysses and departure for Troy.

*Achilleis.*

The style is similar to, but simpler than, that of the *Thebais*.

Much reads like a sketch intended to be worked up more fully later on.

The story of the loves of Achilles and Deidamia, and the discovery-scene, are, however, finished enough.

945. The *Siluae* are a collection of occasional pieces, most of them at least a hundred lines in length, all, save an Alcaic, a Sapphic *Siluae*, and four hendecasyllabic poems, in hexameters. Some of the pieces suggest an epistle of Horace or an elegy of Ovid. The descriptions of works of art or praise of deceased slaves seem developed from similar epigrams in the Greek Anthology. The Gryphus-poem might very well have come from Martial. Panegyric of the emperor, or of the poet's relatives and friends, with their villas, is the main theme. Modern taste seems to prefer the *Siluae* to the epics; yet many of the poems are most artificially constructed according to the rhetorical rules for the corresponding prose *genus*, and the interest naturally attaching to poems dealing with the poet's own times is much diminished by the frequency of mythological similes and allusions. The *epithalamium* with an inset in which Venus wins the lover his bride is found first in the *Siluae*: Claudian and 'classical' poetry in general have faithfully preserved the convention. There is a sentimental trait about Statius: even in the Theban epic he has a simile wherein the elm mourns to think that in its fall it crushed an encircling vine, and in the *Siluae* his love of natural beauty (see especially the descriptions of the immediate surroundings of the villas), and the tone in which he addresses his wife, remind us of the younger Pliny. The gem of the collection is a sonnet-like prayer to Somnus, begging him to cure the poet of the sleeplessness by which he is afflicted. (Cp. Vollmer's *Praef.*, ed. 1890.)

946. Statius was much imitated by Claudian and Sidonius; the grammarians quote him freely. Gerbert seeks for a copy of the *Achilleis*, Dante describes his meeting with his master Virgil in *Purgatory*, Chaucer in his *Merchant's Tale* refers rather confusedly to an incident of the *Thebais*. The *Siluae*, however, disappeared in the Middle Ages: Poggio's discovery of them was followed by a reaction in their favour on the part of the *doctiores*. So, at least, Scaliger tells us, dissenting strongly from it himself. Pope translated the first book of the *Thebaid*, Gray part of the sixth ('And sheathed the terrors of his claws in gold' is a good version and commentary combined for the *auro mansucuerat ungues* of l. 724). Macaulay preferred Lucan, and found in all the *Thebais* but two lines (iii 56—57) worthy of a great poet. We have seen that Pope and Coleridge reverse this judgment; Goethe gives high praise to Statius' descriptive powers.

947. Ti. Catius Silius Italicus (25—101), consul in 68, friend of Vitellius and one of the witnesses to the conference between that emperor and Sabinus in 69. He was a Stoic and committed suicide on account of an incurable tumour. Possibly part of his poem was published after Domitian's death.

The longest of the Roman epic poems is also the worst. As we follow, in the seventeen books of the *Punica*, the trailing course of the Hannibalic war, we feel that Silius is as devoid of judgment as he is of originality and

inspiration. Not an item of the epic apparatus is omitted: there is an *inferno* (after Homer; a *νεκρομαντεία*, not a Virgilian *κατάβασις*), a book of games, catalogues, battle-scenes innumerable (Trasimene claiming one book, Cannae two!), and, of course, divine machinery, with the gods joining in the fray at Cannae, and Minerva saving Hannibal in a cloud. A warm admirer of Virgil, whose tomb was on his Campanian estate, Silius rifles the poet's verses and episodes most systematically: none ever wore borrowed plumes so ill. The twin episode of *Aen.* x 390 ff is the common prey of all the later epics: in Silius it becomes a brief comedy, or tragedy, of errors, which the author doubtless thought a marvel of realism, though it is really as grotesque as any of the worst things in the *Metamorphoses*. Silius has not even a style of his own: the genuineness of a long passage in Book viii is doubted, and it is far from easy to resolve the doubts; a Renaissance scholar, who would certainly have found it hard to keep up the style of Lucan, Valerius or Statius for eighty lines, might mimic the watery colours of the *Punica*. One wonders whether Silius might not have done something as a prosaist; as a poet, he has at least the quality of clearness, even if it be but the clearness of a shallow stream in level country. There is some interest about the story of Regulus, told by an old soldier in the sixth Book: it may owe something to Ennius, who appears as a combatant in one of the battle-scenes. The episode of the captive horse, which recognises its former master among the wounded, throws its Carthaginian rider and hastens to the dying man's side, is one of many traces of the lively interest in the animal world, which may be noticed in writers of the silver age. Their similes are full of such things, and Silius' attempts in this direction are as happy as anything in his work. But everything is long-drawn and cold; everything reminds us of the epic for which Swift wrote the plan and Blackmore provided the model.

948. Martial praises his patron Silius: Pliny the younger credits him with industry rather than genius. The ancient writers as a whole, and the Middle Ages, ignore him. Since Poggio's recovery of the work, the number of people who have read the whole of it cannot be large. Gray read him, not necessarily right through. Addison often quotes him in the 'Remarks', as he 'has taken more pains on the geography of Italy than any other of the Latin poets'. Pope borrows some phrases from Addison's renderings, and the passage ending with 'Alps on Alps arise' in the *Essay on Criticism* (232) is surely from Silius' third Book (92). Coleridge in shame confesses that he never read him; Macaulay records with a *deo gratias* the accomplishment of the labour; elsewhere, he revenges himself with the phrases 'languid hexameters' and 'nauseous folly'.

949. M. Valerius Martialis (c. 40—104), born at Bilbilis in Spain, came about 64 to Rome, where he found many patrons, including Pliny the younger and Silius. He is a typical *cliens*, and, when, about 98, he returned to Spain, Martial. Pliny provided him with funds for the journey.

Catullus has given us the Roman version of the Greek epigram.

Marsus and Pedo, whose epic, as we saw (§ 933), was of the type characteristic of the silver age, probably did much towards the development which Martial represents, with his pointed wit and the motto *agnoscat mores uita legatque suos*. The poet does not aim high. 'I am he, *quem non miraris, sed, puto, lector, amas*'. Critic-rivals might find fault with the fare he gave the public. Martial simply replies:—*mallem conuiuis quam placuisse cocis*. More troublesome were plagiarists, or those who palmed off their scurrilous work on him, of all people in the world, whose own principle was *parcere personis, dicere de uitiis*, and who carefully gives false names to those whom he wishes to satirise. Most of his epigrams are satirical, others sing the praise of the emperor or the poet's patrons and friends: obituary notices, and descriptions from life in Rome, Italy, or Spain, are very common. The obscenity and the sponging tone of many poems give no very pleasant impression of the man, though he seems to have been a good friend and some of the funeral pieces show refined and delicate feeling. The book on the exhibitions that celebrated the opening of the amphitheatre of Titus, and the two collections of labels for Saturnalia-presents, have comparatively little interest for us. Martial's fame rests on the epigrams proper, and it is perhaps possible, even in this brief account, to classify some of their leading characteristics. Contrast is a very common factor: sometimes it inspires the whole epigram (cp. xii 50 on one who kept snug greenhouses, but draughty guest-chambers); more often it is concentrated at the end (c.g. *uigilare lue est, peruigilare graue est*). Sometimes the point turns on the name to be applied to a given phenomenon. Proculeia is divorced, just when her husband is going bankrupt: *discidium non est hoc, Proculeia, lucrum est*; a man feigns sickness for the sake of the dainties that will be sent him: *febrem creditis esse? gula est*. Similar in principle is,—'No, indeed, Sextus, you're not in debt: *debet enim, si quis soluere, Sexte, potest*'. Whimsical turns abound; a shield-whirling juggler is told: '*falli | non potes: arte opus est ut tibi parma cadat*'. Puns are not uncommon: '*maius, Rufe, cocum scindere quam leporem*', he says to one who flogs his cook instead of carving the underdone hare. But, next to contrast, *oxymoron* and *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* probably supply most of the epigrams. One example of each must suffice. A man kills himself to escape falling into the enemy's hands: *non furor est, ne moriari, mori?* 'You never ask me to dinner: now, as punishment, no matter how you beg, I'll'—'Well, what will you do?' '*ueniam!*'

950. Martial is the model for the epigram, as now understood. Cowley and Herrick translate and imitate, Montaigne often quotes him: indeed the latter's comparison of Martial and Catullus might serve as a text for an interesting disquisition on the relative merits of the writers of the Golden and Silver ages (*Essais* ii 10). Lessing's study of the poet is well known. Examples of the influence he has exercised outside pure literature are the familiar sundial-device, *pereunt et imputantur*, and the doggerel beginning 'I do not love you, Dr Fell' (Tom Brown's *Works*, iv 100; cp. Martial, i 32).



951. Decimus Iunius Iuuenalis, born at Aquinum. He is said to have practised rhetoric till middle age, and to this probably refers the epithet *facundus* in Martial (vii 91, 1), who (c. 92—102) addresses several of the epigrams to him. The lives of the poet are numerous but contradictory: all agree that he suffered banishment, and the oldest of them gives as the cause of the disaster his references to Paris in the seventh Satire. His latest Satires are later than 127 A.D. The inscription *C. I. L.* x 5382 does not give the praenomen and probably does not belong to the poet at all (cp. Schanz, § 418).

Juvenal's first Satire is an introduction, declaring that vice had reached its zenith, and laying down the principle that only the dead will be attacked. The second and ninth deal with the seamiest side of ancient morals. The subjects of the others, briefly, are: (3) no place for the poor but honest at Rome, (4) Domitian's council-meeting anent a monstrous mullet, (5) the client's dinner with his patron, (6) woman, (7) the low position of literary professions, (8) virtue the only nobility, (10) the vanity of human wishes, (11) a simple dinner, (12) narrow escape of a friend at sea, (13) consolation to a friend who has been defrauded of his *depositum*, (14) the power for evil (especially avarice) of a father's example, (15) cannibalism in Egypt, (16) the privileges of a soldier. It will be noticed that literary questions do not come within the purview of this kind of satire: there is nothing like Horace's Second Book of *Epistles* or Persius' first Satire. Resemblances to Seneca's moral writings or Martial's epigrams are, naturally, numerous. Ribbeck's theory that the last seven Satires were from another and inferior hand is now abandoned. No such hand wrote the tenth Satire, and the 'differences of style and matter' are sometimes non-existent, never sufficient to disprove Juvenal's authorship. When, for instance, it is pleaded that mythological and historical allusion is much commoner in the later Satires, the answer is that they correspond more closely to the philosophical *loci* of the declamations, in which allusions to Nestor and Priam, Marius and Pompey are frequent. Vigour of expression and power of vivid description characterise earlier and later Satires alike. To the one Juvenal owes the privilege of being one of the most quoted of ancient authors; to the other we are indebted for countless impressions of Roman life. From the *probitas laudatur et alget* of the first Satire to the *maxima debetur puero reverentia* of the fourteenth, runs a long series of maxims and epigrams weakened only by posterity's abuse of them; at least a score are so common that one could hardly select this as being more familiar than that. What a gallery of portraits the third Satire alone contains! Could the saying that 'man's husk changes, not the kernel' find after illustration than in the ease with which Johnson fitted that Satire and the tenth to his own century? Juvenal was a rhetor before he took to satire and he retained some of the faults of his old profession. The tendency to exaggerate is obvious; he himself (vi 634 f) pictures his reader objecting that some of the tragedies are invented, and the younger Pliny shows us a very different picture of the day. Juvenal has no keen sense of humour, though humour is present in such passages as those where Nero's poetry figures as his worst crime, or

the poetaster in August as the worst danger of life in Rome, and in cynical turns like 'A big price for a mullet! Of course, if he bought it as a present for a man on whose will he had an eye, I wouldn't say a word: *nil tale expectes: emit sibi*'. The elaborate descriptions, in which we are spared no detail, are another sign of weakness.

952. Juvenal has always been a favourite. There are *scholia* dating back to the fourth century, and Sidonius refers to and quotes him. In the Middle Ages he was a school-author along with Persius, with whom he is joined, e.g. in Pierre Pithou's celebrated ms. Montaigne loved him, Dryden translated him, the *Spectator* drew many a motto from him. Of Johnson's adaptation we have spoken above. In 1899 was discovered in the Bodleian Library a ms containing in the sixth Satire a passage of 34 lines, up to then unknown, and regarded by many competent judges as the work of Juvenal.

953. PERVIGILIUM VENERIS. Author and date uncertain. Attributed by many to Florus, a writer of Hadrian's time, by some to Tiberianus, a fourth-century poet. Both write the same trochaic metre, and show a similar taste for nature.

The poem consists of ninety-three trochaic tetrameters, the refrain *cras amet qui nunquam amavit, quique amavit cras amet* occurring at the beginning and end, and in seven other places (at irregular intervals). The occasion is a festival of Venus. 'The spring is come: tomorrow Venus holds court; tomorrow is the wedding-day of the rosebuds she has fostered: the Nymphs and Cupid, dangerous though unarmed, will be there; Diana must let the woods rest from the chase, for three nights long will the dancing last. Tomorrow is the day when Heaven wedded Earth, when Venus sprang from the sea, Venus who sways heaven, earth and sea, who gave Lavinia to Aeneas, Ilia to Mars. See, kine and flocks prepare, and the nightingale sings of love. *Ille cantat: nos tacemus: quando uer uenit meum? | quando fiam uti chelidon, ut tacere desinam?* The melancholy and sympathy with Nature give the poem an original and modern tone, but artificiality is there all the same (e.g. anaphora of *uer* five times, *cras* thrice, *ipsa* thrice, all within the first twelve lines; *de* five times in two lines). The poem was translated by Parnell and is worth comparing with Schiller's *Triumph der Liebe*.

954. M. Aurelius Olympius Nemesianus, of Carthage: lived in the time of Carus and his sons (282-4).

Nemesianus' *Eclogues* are four in number, their subjects (1) praise of a deceased Meliboeus, sung by a young shepherd, (2) lament of two shepherds that the parents of their mistress refuse them access to her, (3) the childhood of Bacchus and the introduction of the vine, sung by Pan to three shepherds, (4) railing of two shepherds against their unkind lovers: the amoebaeon stanzas end with a refrain. Calpurnius is imitated, at times slavishly, but Nemesianus is the truer poet. The third *Eclogue* is the best; the description of the boy Bacchus playing with

Silenus is as pretty as anything in Statius; the line *simas tenero conludit pollice nares* reminds one of a group in Leighton's *Captive Andromache*.

The *Cynēgetica* break off abruptly at l. 325. In the preface, of some 100 lines, the poet scoffs at the staleness of the mythological themes, and promises to sing anon of the victories of Carus' sons. The method of selecting the young cubs, their diet, training and diseases occupy the next 140 lines or so. Sixty lines deal with horses, and at 299 we come to nets. The style is clear and simple, but dull. In archbishop Hincmar's day it was a school-book (cent. ix). Our own Somerville is no better perhaps, but certainly no worse.

955. Decimus Magnus Ausonius (310—c. 395), born at Bordeaux, son of a physician, educated in his native town and at Toulouse. In 364 he was summoned from Bordeaux, where he was *grammaticus*, to Trèves, to undertake the education of the young Gratian. Becoming a favourite at court, he received high office (consul 379). On Gratian's death he returned to Bordeaux. Ausonius.

Ausonius was a Professor, and much of his literary work is no better than the average effusion of the Common-room poet. He translates with ease epigrams of the Greek Anthology and uses Virgilian and Horatian tags without effort. There may be poverty of thought, but the metrical *trous de force* do all they can to draw attention from it. The *Technopaegnium* is entirely devoted to these gymnastic exercises, but they are not confined to that work; the forty-three hexameters of one of the religious poems cannot be censured as dull, when once the reader has recognised that they are constructed throughout on the principle of starting with a monosyllable and working up by a kind of syllabic arithmetical progression to the resounding quinquessyllable at the end. *Spes deus aeternae stationis conciliator!* The *Ludus septem sapientum* may have played at Bordeaux the part of the donnish plays acted at Cambridge in the sixteenth century. Very characteristic are the twenty-six short poems in very varied metres, telling the fame of Ausonius' colleagues. Some, he naively adds, had but slight claims to the honour—*sed quia nostro docuere in aevo | commemorandi*. Of Ausonius himself and his friends, we hear much. An elegiac preface narrates his biography, the *Ephēmēris* his daily occupations, revealing the fact that Ausonius bore his Christianity lightly. Besides the *Epicedion in patrem*, the *Parentalia* give short memorial notices of various deceased members of the family. Many are interesting, the poem in memory of his wife full of feeling, but the work is done too thoroughly, and we grow dizzy in the maze of *consoceri* and *consobrini*, *amitae* and *adfinēs*. The *Epistles* are not very interesting, except so far as they affect Symmachus and Paulinus. The former is the well-known champion of the old faith; the latter, a pupil of Ausonius, was afterwards bishop of Nola. He loved his old teacher, but the difference between the two men was great, and the series of letters shows how their friendship begins to flag. The *Ordo nobilitum urbium* is terribly dull, until, with the theme of Burdigala, patriotism takes the place of inspiration and the warmer style in

some degree prepares us for the wonders of *Mosella*. The plan of this poem is artificial enough—general praise first, and then details: the fish of the river, its services to gods and men, its villas, its tributaries, the fame of its *accolae*. But no Latin poem so persistently dwells upon the beauties of Nature. The promise of the finest passages in the *Silvae* of Statius here finds fulfilment in the description of the scarce-veiled river-bed, with its sand rippled and chequered with river grasses, mosses and pebbles; in the glowing picture of the scene at sunset when the sloping vineyards are reflected in the waters; in the conspicuous feeling for colour, the dominant note of the catalogue of fish (see esp. 110 ff). The metre is unfortunately the Ovidian, but at times (e.g. 250 ff) the poet's enthusiasm sweeps away this convention of his age, and we get the Virgilian setting that this gem of late Latinity deserved to find.

956. Aurelius Prudentius Clemens (348—c. 410), born in Spain (Saragossa?). He Prudentius. held two important governorships and a high military post.

Prudentius writes lyric and also didactic poetry, the former in various metres, with the iambic predominating, the latter in Lucretian hexameters. The twelve hymns of the *Cāthēmērīna* are much longer than those of Ambrosius, as they readily indulge in description and narrative. The *Peri Stephanon* are poems on the Christian martyrs, each usually narrating the collision of a Saint with the authorities, his trial and execution. Prudentius' lyrics are graceful, yet simple. The Latin plays its new part without apparent effort: now and then, only, are the colours rather too lurid. Of the hexameter poems, the *contra Symmachum*, an attack on the old religion, reveals the poet as a staunch patriot: it is sad, when one recalls the events of 410 A.D., to hear his Rome claim to be safer from sack than ever she was in Hannibal's time. The *Hūmartīgēnia* contains a very Lucretian account of the degeneration of Nature which followed the Fall, and the earliest elaborate portrait of Satan from a Roman pen. Similar originality appears in the conception of the *Psychomachia*, a battle between the Vices and the Virtues. Prudentius impresses us as one of the most independent of the Roman poets: he shows reminiscences, but no servile imitation, of Lucretius, Virgil and Horace.

Portions of the lyrics passed into the use of the Church, and the allegory of the *Psychomachia* had much influence in the Middle Ages and later. Prudentius is the only Christian Latin poet, in whom Erasmus recognised real literary power.

957. Claudius Claudianus (died c. 408), born at (or at least mainly connected with) Alexandria. He came to Rome in 395 and became a *cliens* of Stilicho, in whose fall he was probably involved. In the fifteenth century was found the inscription set up to his honour, during his lifetime, in Trajan's forum.

In Claudian we have Rome's first professional court-poet. Honorius' marriage and consulships, Stilicho's victories, Serena's praises, are not, it



is true, his only theme. The *de raptu Proserpinae* is a mythological epic; the three Books still extant bring us to the moment when Ceres starts in quest of her daughter; the style is most like that of Statius. The elegiac prefaces which introduce many of the works, the epigrams, epistles and idylls, contain much good matter: especially interesting among the separate poems are the *Phoenix* and *Senex Veronensis*. But the characteristic part of Claudian's writings consists of the poems dealing with contemporary events, historical epics, in which the new elements of comparative brevity and pungent satire are combined with the old-fashioned motives and supernatural machinery of that literary *genus*.

Claudian is an industrious borrower, of course from Virgil and Ovid, even from Silius, though his favourite first-century writers are Seneca, Lucan and Statius, especially the last. The *epithalamia* are composed on Statian lines, many of Statius' neologisms reappear. Claudian had indeed much in common with the Neapolitan, especially his passion for prettiness and his skill in word-painting. One may instance the description of the terrified cattle drawing the wild-beast cages for Stilicho's *munus*, or the simile in which oxen scattered in the woods gather to the herdsman's whistle: *rara per obscuras adparent cornua frondes*. On the other hand, as a satirist, Claudian, whilst maintaining a very definite style of his own, often resembles Juvenal, who might well have penned viii 196 ff, as Pope might have envied the vigour with which Eutropius *contemptu iam liber* is compared to a mangy dog, which its master is glad to let loose and be rid of—*excuto lucratus uincula collo*. The similes often show great power of observation, as when Eutropius' fussiness suggests a mother-in-law, who has come a long way to visit her son's wife:—*uix lassa resedit | et iam uina petit*. Perhaps, in some cases, Claudian was thinking of a scene from a mime. Of course the imitation of first-century models brought with it its own Nemesis, and Gibbon has pilloried the 'intolerable wit' of vii 99 ff. The wit is really more Lucan's than Claudian's, but one feels that, in such cases, the imitator is worse than the inventor; he has no excuse for admiring the monstrosities of another man's imagination. The influence of the declamations is only too clear in such thoughts as 'Stilicho swam Addua to meet the foe, Horatius swam Tiber with his back to the foe', and in the readiness to repeat an idea over and over again, in a different form. Claudian's verse is insufferable. The symmetrical schemes, into which, since Ovid, the hexameter was so prone to fall, recur with sickening frequency: in his first twenty lines we have *uoluis inexhausto redeuntia saccula motu, efflantes roseum frenis spumantibus ignem, continuum simili seruantia lege tenorem*. A novelty, and a pleasing one, is the metre of part of Honorius' *epithalamium*, in which three Anacreontic lines are followed by two dactylo-trochaics.

Claudian himself became the model of Sidonius. In the *Parliament of Fowles* Chaucer reproduces one of the prefaces, the famous passage on dreams; Cowley translated the *Senex Veronensis*. The satiric treatment of

Rome's foes finds a parallel in Marvell's lines on the Dutch, and the short epics suggest the 'gazette in poetry' of Waller and Addison. Gibbon's criticism (*Decline and Fall*, end of chap. 30) seems a sound one; in the previous chapter, he refers to 'the beautiful exordium' of the invective against Rufinus. Coleridge observed in Claudian 'an oscillation between the objective poetry of the ancients and the subjective mood of the moderns', and actually admires his 'gift of pleasingly expressing the same thought in different language'. A well-known passage referring to Stilicho (xxv 459 ff) was once applied by Disraeli in the House of Commons to the victor of Waterloo.

958. Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, born in Gaul, *magister officiorum* at the court of Namatian. Honorius and *praefectus urbi*. His poem appeared in 416.

The *Mosella* of Ausonius starts as the record of a journey, to become mere panegyric. Namatian's elegiac *de reditu suo* begins with a hundred lines devoted to a panegyric of Rome, and then becomes the journal of a voyage from Rome to Gaul. Of the interesting details one may instance the description of the difficult entrance to Vada, where the course was marked out by stakes, of the salt-works near Albinus' villa, and of the harbour of Pisae, where seaweed formed a natural breakwater. The absence of all reference to the imperial family may be accidental: something is certainly lost at the beginning of the poem, and we have only 70 lines of the second (and last) book. But there is some ground for regarding the silence as intentional. Namatian is one of the old school: style and metre are very classical, the school-rhetoric appears everywhere. He hates Stilicho, the destroyer of the Sibylline books; he hates the Jews; he hates the monks of Capraria and Gorgo. Ausonius hinted to Paulinus that the life of the recluse savoured of that of Bellerophon, 'wandering solitary and distraught on the Aleian plain'. Namatian repeats the thrust, adding that Circe is now eclipsed: *tunc mutabantur corpora, nunc animi*. With such a writer, whose bitterness testifies to the firm root which the new order of things has struck, this chapter on Classical Latin poetry may fitly end.

### C. PROSE FROM CATO TO CASSIODORUS.

959. From the beginning, prose was the natural medium for official registers and annals, for family pedigrees and funeral orations, for political and forensic speeches, and for legal enactments. The beginnings of rhythmical prose may be traced in the laws, and in the prayers, of the early Romans. As an example of the latter we may mention the central portion of the ancient prayer of the paterfamilias, preserved in Cato's treatise on Agriculture (c. 141), where each of the nine lines, of the same general type as *pastores pecuaque | salua seruassis*, is divided into two parts, usually with different

Beginnings of  
rhythmical  
prose.

alliterative effects in each, and with the rhythm of the second half corresponding more or less closely with that of the Saturnian measure. Of the fragments of the Twelve Tables, perhaps the oldest Roman document that deserves the name of a book (450 B.C.), the most perfect in point of rhythm is the law:—*si nox furtum faxsit, si im occisit, iure caesus esto*. Symmetry of form may also be found in the ancient precept which was one of the *carmina* of the ‘*Marcus uates*’:—*postremus dicas | primus taceas* (Isidore, *Or.* vi 8, 12). The very word *carmen* was originally applied to a set form of words in more or less rhythmical prose—to a *lex horrendi carminis*, and to a *sollemne carmen precationis* (Liv. i 26, 6; xxxix 15, 1), as well as to metrical verse, its principal meaning in later times.

960. The earliest Roman writer was the famous censor, Appius Claudius, whose speech in opposition to Pyrrhus’ overtures for peace was published after its delivery in the Senate-House in 280 B.C., and was seen by Cicero two centuries later (*Cato maior*, 16; *Brutus*, 61). The earliest extant remains of prose literature were produced by another censor, the elder Cato.

Appius  
Claudius,  
280 B.C.

961. M. Porcius Cato (234—149), born at Tusculum, filled the offices of quaestor in Sicily and Africa (204), aedile (199), and praetor in Sardinia (198). As consul in 195, he commanded the Roman forces in Spain. The fame of his censorship (184) led to his being specially distinguished as *Cato Censorius*.

Cato.

Cato represents a reaction against the advance of Greek influence which followed the close of the Second Punic War. Nevertheless he learnt Greek in his old age, and he may even have acquired some knowledge of the language at an earlier date. It was primarily for the benefit of his son that he compiled the **earliest Roman encyclopaedia**, which included treatises on rhetoric, medicine, and agriculture, and probably also on military affairs and on law. In his lost work on medicine, after premising that Greek literature deserved a passing glance rather than a serious study, he warned his son against Greek physicians (Plin. *N. H.* xxix 14). The only work of Cato that has survived is his treatise *De agri cultura*, the **earliest extant monument of Roman literature**. Its style, however, has been much modernised by later copyists.

*De agri  
cultura.*

In the opening sentences agriculture is lauded as a pursuit productive of brave men and sturdy soldiers, and as a nobler and a less perilous calling than that of commerce. The main bulk of the work is concerned with rude prosaic precepts of agriculture, which form an effective contrast with Virgil’s poetic treatment of the same theme in the *Georgics*. It also deals with details of domestic economy, including primitive medical prescriptions and culinary recipes, as well as admonitions on religious observances, and on the use of magical incantations. As a whole it is marked by a severe simplicity; and the general tone is that of a rigid and uncompromising authority expressing itself in the language of oracular responses or terse and precise aphorisms. ‘Youth’ (we are told), ‘is the time for sowing seed, and middle age for building’ (c. 3); ‘the bailiff’s wife must stand in awe of her master, and must remember that it is her master alone who is

responsible for the religious observances of the household' (c. 143); 'the master must be apt to sell, rather than apt to buy' (*uendacem, non emacem*, c. 2, 7); and a similar saying of Cato's is preserved by Seneca, *emas non quod opus est, sed quod necesse est: quod non opus est, asse carum est* (*Ep.* 94, 27). The treatise is often quoted by Pliny and Columella.

Cato's *Origines*, a work on ancient Roman and Italian history, mentioned by Cornelius Nepos (*Cato*, 3, 3), has not survived. Of his *Orations* as many as 150 were known to Cicero (*Brutus*, 65), now represented by fragments of only half that number. They give proof of the transforming effect of Hellenic influence. Brief and inartistic clauses are here combined with an artistic type of period, e.g. 'scio solere plerisque hominibus, rebus secundis atque prolixis atque prosperis, animum excellere atque superbiam atque ferociam augescere atque crescere'. These are the opening words of the fragment of the Speech on the Rhodians preserved by Gellius, who declares that its style might perhaps have been more precise and more harmonious, but certainly not more vigorous or more vivid (vi 3, 53). With Cato the true orator is a *uir bonus dicendi peritus*, and this definition is emphatically approved by Quintilian (xii 1, 1).

962. While the Latinity of Cato's treatise on agriculture has been obviously modernised by a later reviser, the **earliest work in Latin prose which has been preserved in its original integrity** is that entitled *Rhetoricorum ad C. Herennium libri quattuor*. It has been described by Spengel as a *liber auro pretiosior*, and it is, in fact, the best practical treatise on rhetoric that has come down to us from ancient times. The passages which reappear in Cicero *De Inventione*, are more probably borrowed by Cicero from the work before us, than derived from a common source. After the time of Quintilian, it was neglected for a while, but came once more into notice when it was ascribed to Cicero himself by St Jerome. It thus became one of the popular manuals of the Middle Ages.

In the Revival of Learning, Laurentius Valla<sup>1</sup> deemed it unworthy of Cicero, and Raphael Regius (1491) definitely declined to ascribe it to his pen, preferring to suggest as a possible author the rhetorician Cornificius, who is repeatedly quoted by Quintilian (iii 1, 21; ix 3, 89 and 98). This opinion was supported by Victorius (1537) and others, and finally by Kayser (1854). The work was written after the death of P. Sulpicius in 88 B.C. (i 25); it is even later than 86 B.C., as the passage in iv 68 refers to Marius rather than to Sulla. The author has been identified (by Bochmann) with the Cornificius who was born c. 123 B.C., and perished in the Sullan reign of terror which followed close on the publication of the treatise, while Kayser has suggested his identity with the Cornificius who unsuccessfully competed with Cicero for election as one of the consuls of 63 B.C. These opinions are opposed by Marx (1894), who is content to regard it as an anonymous work.

The author shows a manly independence of thought, and a contempt for the countless subdivisions current in the Greek text-books. His thoroughly practical spirit prompts him to draw his illustrations mainly from Roman history and Roman oratory. His

<sup>1</sup> 'Cum enim Laurentius Valla perquam acri uir iudicio quodam in libello asserat opusculum uix Cicerone esse dignum...', Regius, ap. Marx, p. 62.



examples of style are not borrowed from others, but are composed by himself, and are thus of the nature of practical 'demonstrations' in composition. Some of these examples are almost proverbial in their point and in their terseness of form:—*'deligere oportet, quem uelis diligere'*; *'esse oportet ut uiuas; non uiuere ut edas'*; *'optima uiuendi ratio est eligenda; eam iucundam consuetudo reddet'* (iv 24, 29, 39). One of them is the earliest extant reminiscence of a celebrated saying of Simonides:—*'poëma loquens pictura, pictura tacitum poëma debet esse'* (iv 39); while, as a reason why pathetic passages should be as brief as possible, the author is the first to quote a phrase afterwards ascribed to the rhetorician Apollonius:—*'nihil enim lacruma citius arescit'* (ii 50). At the beginning of his last book he claims to have always kept to the point, and to have dealt with each topic in its proper place, *'nihil neque ante rem neque praeter rem locuti sumus'*; and at the end, he recognises, like a true Roman, that there are nobler aims in life than a perfect mastery of rhetoric:—*'alia sunt meliora, quae multo attentius petimus in uita'*<sup>1</sup>.

963. M. Terentius Varro (116—27), a native of the Sabine town of Reate, was educated by the Roman philologist, L. Aelius Stilo, and by the Greek philosopher, Antiochus of Ascalon. A Pompeian in politics, he was Varro. taken prisoner by Caesar in Spain (49), and was pardoned by his captor. He afterwards dedicated the second part of his *Antiquitates* to Caesar, who entrusted him with the superintendence of the public libraries of Rome (Suet. *Caes.* 44). Proscribed by Antonius in 43, he owed his safety to the interposition of Fufius Calenus, and passed the remainder of his life in retirement, devoting himself entirely to literary and antiquarian studies.

The number of separate works produced by Varro is estimated to have been about 74. St Jerome's list of about half that number is preserved in the preface to Rufinus' translation of Origen's *Homilies on Genesis*.

His treatise *De Lingua Latina* is the earliest extant Roman work on Grammar. Of the twenty-five books into which this great work was divided, the last twenty-one were dedicated to Cicero, but only the first six of these have survived. The first three are on Etymology, dealing in turn with the names of places, with terms denoting time, and with poetic expressions. Their value depends mainly on their quotations from the old Latin poets. They abound in marvellous etymologies, but amid these we find the important fact, that Varro had himself seen *meridies* spelt as *medidies* on a sun-dial in Praeneste (vi 4). The next three are concerned with the controversy on Analogy and Anomaly, in which the author takes up an intermediate position inclining to the side of the Analogists.

At the age of 80 Varro wrote the three books *Rerum Rusticarum* (37 B.C.). The first of these is on agriculture; the second on sheep and oxen; the third on poultry, together with animals kept in parks or enclosures, such as boars, hares and deer, as well as snails and dormice, with an excursus on bees, and a concluding paragraph on the management of fish-ponds. The work is in the form of a dialogue, and, as a whole, it is the most important of the ancient treatises on *res rusticae* now extant.

*De Lingua  
Latina.*

*Rerum Rusti-  
carum libri.*

<sup>1</sup> For an analysis of the whole, see Wilkins on Cicero, *De Oratore*, i pp. 51—64.

In the course of the first chapter the author gives us a list of fifty Greek writers on the subject; in the very first sentence of the second chapter he pauses to draw a distinction between the old form *aedituus* and the new form *aeditimus*; and, immediately afterwards, appropriately places the scene of the first dialogue in view of the map of Italy painted on the wall of the Temple of Tellus, in Rome. In the body of the work he is constantly complaining about the loss of the ancient simplicity of manners; he wears the reader by dividing and subdividing his subject into sections and subsections; and he seldom loses an opportunity for playing on the significance of a proper name, or for indulging in fanciful etymologies. The prefaces to the three books may be read with greater pleasure than the rest. In the first we note the two expressive proverbs: *si est homo bulla, eo magis senex*; and *Romanus sedendo uincit*. The second opens with the sentence: *uiri magni nostri maiores non sine causa praeponerant rusticos Romanos urbanis*. In the third the phrase *diuina natura dedit agros, ars humana aedificauit urbes* is an anticipation of the line in Cowper's *Task*: 'God made the country, and man made the town'. This work of Varro's is the main authority followed by Virgil in the first 413 lines of the *Third Georgic*.

His *Saturae Menippeae*, composed in various forms of verse mingled with prose, have only survived in fragments of their poetic passages. The titles of some of them are proverbial sayings, such as *caue canem*, and *nescis quid uesper*. His *Logistorici*, or discussions on topics connected with history and philosophy, are mainly represented by the fragments of the dialogue *Catus de liberis educandis*. Their titles, which are all of the same type, supply the models followed by Cicero in his *Laelius de amicitia* and in his *Cato de senectute*.

Varro's works on Roman history included the forty-one books of *Antiquitates*. *Antiquitates*, consisting of 25 books on *res humanae*, and 16 on *res diuinae*, the contents of which are mainly known through St Augustine, *De Ciuitate Dei* (vi 2—vii 35). The books on the geography of the Roman Empire were among the authorities followed by Verrius Flaccus and the elder Pliny.

In the nine books of his *Disciplinae* he produced the earliest encyclopaedia of the liberal arts:—Grammar, Dialectic, Rhetoric, Geometry, Arithmetic, Astrology, Music, Medicine, and Architecture; and the first seven of these, transmitted through the text-books of Martianus Capella, Cassiodorus, and Isidore, were recognised in the *triuium* and the *quadriuium* of the Middle Ages. His

*Imagines*. *Imagines* consisted of brief biographies of 700 Greek and Roman celebrities, with a portrait of each (Plin. *N. H.* xxxv 11). His writings on literary criticism comprised works on poetry and style, and on the drama and Plautus. The 21 plays recognised by Varro, and accordingly called the *Fabulae Varronianae*, may be identified with the 20 extant plays, together with the fragmentary *Vidularia*. He also wrote on Libraries, and was the only author whose bust was exhibited during his own lifetime in the public library of Asinius Pollio. Characterised by Cicero as *diligentissimus inuestigator antiquitatis*, and by Quintilian as *uir Romanorum eruditissimus*, he never attained the distinction of being described as *uir eloquentissimus*. Had he spent more pains on his style and had he written less, doubtless a larger portion of his learned works would have descended to posterity. (See also Heitland's *Roman Republic*, iii 439—452.)

964. M. Tullius Cicero (106—43), the son of a Roman knight, was born at Arpinum.

After studying rhetoric in Rome, he pleaded his first cause in 81, continued his studies in Athens and Rhodes (79—77), and, after his return, filled the offices of quaestor (75), aedile (69), praetor (66), and consul (63). As consul, he suppressed the Catilinarian conspiracy, but the fact that certain of the conspirators, who were Roman citizens, had been put to death without the sanction of the people, led to his being attacked by the tribune Clodius and sent into exile in April, 58. He returned to Rome in September, 57, was augur in 53, and proconsul of Cilicia for the year succeeding 31 July, 51. During the Civil War he was a partisan of Pompey, and remained abroad from 49 to 47, when he was permitted by Caesar to return to Rome.

The enforced leisure of 46—45 was spent in a large variety of literary pursuits. Recalled to public life by the assassination of Caesar on the Ides of March, 44, he came into conflict with Antonius, and was put to death under the second triumvirate on 7 Dec. 43. The following is a chronological conspectus of his extant works.

c. 84	<i>De Inuentione.</i>	56	pro Sestio, in Vatinius, pro
81	pro Quinctio.		Caelio, de provinciis consularibus, pro Balbo.
80	pro Sexto Roscio Amerino.		
c. 77 (or 66)	pro Roscio Comoedo.	55	in Pisonem; <i>De Oratore.</i>
c. 72	pro Tullio.	54	pro Plancio, pro Scauro, pro Rabirio Postumo.
70	orationes Verrinae.		
69	pro Fonteio, pro Caecina.	54—51	<i>De Republica.</i>
68—44	epp. ad Atticum.	52	pro Milone; 52—46 <i>De Legibus.</i>
66	de imp. Cn. Pompeii, pro Cluentio.	46	pro Marcello, pro Ligario; <i>Brutus, Paradoxa, Orator, de optimo genere oratorum, de partitione oratoria.</i>
63	orationes consulares:—de lege agraria, pro Rabirio perduellionis reo, in Catilinam, pro Murena.	45	pro rege Deiotaro.
62	pro Sulla, pro Archia.	45 f	<i>De Finibus, Academica.</i>
62—43	epp. ad familiares.	44	<i>Tusculanae Disputationes.</i>
60—54	epp. ad Quintum fratrem.		<i>De Natura Deorum, Cato maior, De Divinatione, De Fato, Timaeus, Topica, Laelius, De Officiis; orationes Philippicae i—iv.</i>
59	pro Flacco.		
57	orationes post reditum:—in Senatu, ad Quirites, de domo, and	43	orationes Philippicae v—xiv; epp. ad Brutum.
56	de haruspicum responso.		

965. Through the schools of rhetoric the Greek conception of oratory as an art had been established in Rome before 90 B.C. The question arose whether Roman oratory was to be 'Asiatic' or 'Attic'. About 95 B.C. Hortensius stood forth as the representative of both sides of 'Asianism', its 'sententious point' and its 'florid declamation'. Cicero next came forward, on his return from Rhodes in 77, as the representative of that combination of 'Asianism' and 'Atticism', which has been described as 'the Rhodian eclecticism'. As the great Roman master of literary rhetorical prose, he was the Roman counterpart of Isocrates. But he was fully conscious of the greatness of Demosthenes, and found in the varied style of that orator a better pattern for Roman eloquence than in the unadorned plainness of Lysias, who was the favourite model with the extreme Atticists represented about 60 B.C. by Calvus.

Wealth of words, beauty of phrase, a rich and redundant amplitude of expression, and a singularly studious attention to the rhythm of the final clauses of the period, are among the most obvious characteristics of Cicero's oratorical style. While there is an absence of deep and strong passion, there is no lack of pathos. This was so clearly recognised that, whenever two or three counsel were retained in the same case, he always spoke last and thus gained for his client the benefit of his pathetic peroration.

It has been questioned whether he was really an able advocate, but the fact remains that his services were constantly in demand, especially in cases

Cicero as an  
orator.

for the defence. Of his political speeches most were delivered in the Senate, where his own party was in the majority, but his ability and power were also proved in harangues addressed to the people, as when he induced the multitude to relinquish a land-law which was ostensibly put forward as a measure for their own advantage. It is mainly as an orator that he has won the high regard of Quintilian and the younger Pliny, and of every competent critic of Latin style down to the present day.

966. The earliest extant speech, *pro P. Quinctio* (81), was in a private suit for a sum of money alleged to be due from Quinctius. Cicero's argument is clear and logical, showing that, even at the outset of his career, he was able to cope with Hortensius, the counsel on the opposite side. In the speech *pro Quinctio*, Speeches (81-66).  
*pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*, *Sexto Roscio Amerino* (80), the first criminal case in which he was engaged, he obtained the acquittal of his client on a charge of parricide. The highly rhetorical and redundant character of this early speech was recognised by its author in his maturer years (*Or.* 107). The speech delivered in a private suit *pro Q. Roscio Comoedo* (*c.* 77 or 66) is written in the terser, or less turgid, of the two varieties of the Asiatic style (*Brut.* 325)<sup>1</sup>.

After his return from Rhodes, he delivered the *pro Tullio* (72 or 71), in prosecution of one of Sulla's veterans, who had destroyed the country-house of the plaintiff.

In 70 B.C. Cicero rose to the height of a great opportunity in his impeachment of Verres for maladministration in the government of Sicily. He undertook the prosecution at the prompting of Pompeius, while Hortensius was retained for the defence. Cicero's seven speeches began with the *Diuinatio in Caecilium*, in which he successfully claimed the right of appearing as prosecutor. After the delivery of the first speech for the prosecution (*Actio prima*), Verres, foreseeing the result, went into exile. The orator, however, published an elaborate statement of his case in the subsequent five orations, which were never delivered (*Actio secunda*). They rank among the finest of his efforts owing to the variety of the topics treated, and the liveliness and lucidity of their style. They are also among our most important authorities on the government of the provinces, on the history of Sicily, and on the works of ancient art in that island. Twenty-four years later the orator refers with satisfaction to his highly finished descriptions of Henna and Segesta and Syracuse (*Or.* 210). The device by which he gives an air of actuality to a passage that was never spoken is well known:—*'Canephoroe ipsae uocabantur: sed earum artificem quem? quemnam? recte admones, Polyclitum esse dicebant'* (iv 5; cp. *Plin. Epp.* i 20, 10).

The fragmentary *pro Fonteio* (69) is an *actio repetundarum*; the *pro Caecina*, of the same year, turns on the point whether illegal force had been used by the defendant in opposing Caecina's taking possession of a plot of land, of which Caecina's late wife had been a life tenant (§ 475 *supra*).

967. The second period begins with the year of Cicero's praetorship (66), a year marked by two of his greatest orations. In the speech *De imperio Cn. Pompeii* he eloquently supported the *lex Manilia*, which proposed to entrust Pompey with the command of the war against Mithridates and Tigranes. In the same year he successfully defended Cluentius, who had previously charged his step-father Oppianicus with attempting to compass his death by poisoning and had won his case. Oppianicus had gone into exile and had suddenly died. Thereupon Cluentius was charged by his mother with having poisoned his step-father. It

<sup>1</sup> On the date, cp. Morris H. Morgan, in *Harvard Studies*, xii (1901) 237-248; Roby's *Roman Private Law* (1902), ii 502; Norden's *Kunstprosa*, i 227 and *Nachtr.* 12, ed. 2.



is uncertain whether Cluentius was tried on the single charge of murder, or also on the further charge of having bribed the jury at the former trial. This uncertainty arises from the fact that Cicero deliberately threw a cloud over his statement of the case; in fact, he afterwards boasted of his having 'thrown dust in the eyes of the jury' (Quint. ii 17, 21).

The *orationes consulares* of 63 B.C. begin with the three speeches *de lege agraria*, attacking the proposal to appoint a commission with full powers for the purchase and distribution of land in Italy. By this proposal Caesar and the democratic party aimed at counteracting the power of Pompey.

Cicero declared that the ten commissioners would be 'ten kings', a name most hateful to the Roman ear; he also effectively quoted the contemptuous phrase, in which the proposer of the new land-law had spoken of the citizens of Rome in the Senate:— 'urbanam plebem...exhauriendam esse;...quasi de aliqua sentina...loqueretur' (ii 70). In the same year he defended the senator Rabirius, who, at the prompting of Caesar, was now prosecuted by the tribune Labienus for the alleged murder of the tribune Saturninus during a popular tumult 37 years before. Cicero declared that he wished he could claim for Rabirius the honour of having killed the enemy of the Roman people, but the people were unfavourable and Rabirius would have been condemned, had not the augur promptly pulled down the flag on the Ianiculum and thus broken up the assembly.

The crisis of Cicero's destiny came with the last two months of his consulship, and with his detection and suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy. Of the four speeches *In Catilinam*, the first, delivered in the Senate on November 8, charged Catiline with his guilty projects; the second informed the people, on November 9, of the proceedings in the Senate on the previous day, and of the flight of Catiline; the third, on December 3, of the imprisonment of those of the conspirators who had remained in Rome, and of the evidence of the despatches found in the hands of the Allobroges; while in the fourth, pronounced before the Senate on December 5, Cicero declared that no punishment was too great for the crime, and that, as consul, he was ready to execute the sentence, whatever it might be. The fate of the criminals was finally decided by Cato's vehement speech in favour of capital punishment. Before the end of the consular year, and in the very crisis of the conspiracy, Cicero defended the consul-elect, Murena, who was prosecuted under the *lex Tullia de ambitu*, pointing out in the graver portions of his speech how important it was that Murena, and not Catilina, should be one of the consuls for the coming year. In this case, the orator was confronted by two of his friends, the learned lawyer, Seruius Sulpicius, and the grave Stoic, M. Cato. He accordingly devotes all the resources of his wit to attacking the old-fashioned forms of Roman jurisprudence and the impractical dogmas of the Stoic philosophy.

On ceasing to be consul he defended P. Cornelius Sulla (62) on the charge of having taken part in the Catilinarian conspiracy. Cicero established an *alibi*, and also solemnly declared that, during his consulship, he had never heard anything that compromised the defendant. A pleasanter impression is made by his plea for the Greek poet, Archias (62), whose claim to the citizenship of Rome had been attacked. On the legal point at issue the orator says little, but he seizes the occasion for delivering a highly finished panegyric on the delights of literature. The passage beginning with 'saxa et solitudines uoci respondent' (§ 19) was quoted six times by Quintilian, and the recovery of this speech was hailed with rapture by Petrarch (*Var.* 45).

Three years later, in a successful defence of L. Valerius Flaccus (59), who was charged with extortion as proconsul of Asia, Cicero gratefully acknowledges the aid he had received from Flaccus, as praetor, in crushing the Catilinarian conspiracy.

968. In the first of the four speeches *post reditum*, he thanks the Senate for promoting his recall; in the second, he extends his gratitude to the citizens at large; in the third, he claims the restitution of his house on the Palatine, which had been illegally 'consecrated'

by Clodius (57); and, in the fourth, he deals with the declaration of the *haruspices*, that the portents observed in Latium during the previous year proved that certain sacred places were being profaned. Clodius had contended that this referred to Cicero's claim to his house on the Palatine; Cicero retorted that it referred to the impious Clodius (56). The genuineness of all these four speeches has been attacked. The first to raise doubts on this point was Markland (1745), who was effectively answered by J. M. Gesner (1753). The speeches were next attacked by Wolf (1801), and defended in a series of dissertations by Savels (1828, 1833), Lucas (1837), Lahmeyer (1859), Hoffmann (1878), Rück (1881), and Jordan (1886). The delivery of speeches corresponding to the *first* and *third* in the series is attested in Cicero *ad Atticum*, iv 1 and 2, 2; the *fourth* is quoted by Asconius; the *second* is less strongly supported by external evidence.

In the same year Cicero successfully defended Sestius, one of the tribunes of 57 B.C., in a suit *de vi* brought at the instance of Cicero's enemy, Clodius. He was also successful in the prosecution of Vatinius, who had given evidence against Sestius. He next defended Caelius on the charge of having borrowed money from Clodia to bribe some slaves to murder one of the Alexandrian envoys, and of having attempted to poison Clodia when she demanded repayment. The speech throws a lurid light on the moral condition of certain classes of Roman society.

The speech *De provinciis consularibus* (56), one of his finest efforts, successfully pleads for the prolongation of Caesar's government of the provinces of Gaul; while that *pro Balbo* (56) defends a friend of Caesar and Pompey on the charge of unlawfully claiming the citizenship of Rome. The *in Pisonem* (55) is a vehement reply to the ex-consul Piso's complaint that Cicero had prompted his recall from the province of Macedonia. In the *pro Plancio* (54) Cicero successfully defended his client on the charge of resorting to bribery in his canvass for the office of aedile. The speech gives a vivid picture of popular elections in Rome, and closes with a grateful recognition of the defendant's services to Cicero in his exile. Cicero also endeavoured to defend *C. Rabirius Postumus* (54), a partisan of Caesar, on an apparently well-founded accusation of extorting money from Ptolemy Aulètes.

Two years later he defended *Milo* (52) on the charge of murdering Clodius, an act represented by Cicero as committed in self-defence. The speech actually delivered was unsuccessful; the existing speech, which is due to a subsequent revision, has been recognised as a masterpiece of oratorical skill.

969. The fourth and final period corresponds to the last three years of the orator's life. It includes the three *orationes Caesarianae*, delivered before the dictator, Caesar, and the fourteen *Philippics*. The speeches *pro Marcello* and *pro Ligario* (46) are eloquent pleas for the pardon of those two partisans of Pompey. In the *pro rege Deiotaro* (45), Cicero defended the Galatian king on the charge of attempting to murder Caesar. The orator himself had no high opinion of this speech (*Epp.* ix 12, 2). Probably the decision was postponed, and his client saved from a perilous position by the assassination of Caesar.

The speeches delivered after Caesar's death are the famous invectives against Antonius. The first four belong to the last four months of 44 B.C.; and the last ten to the first four months of 43. The *Second Philippic*, purporting to be an immediate reply to Antonius' attack on Cicero in the Senate, was never delivered. It is an indictment of the whole of the political career of Antonius, an eloquent political pamphlet which proved fatal to its author. In the *Ninth Philippic* the orator pauses in the series of attacks on Antonius to propose the erection of a public statue in memory of Servius Sulpicius, who had died in the service of the State. The last

*pro Sestio.*  
*in Vatinius.*  
*pro Caelio.*

*De provinciis*  
*consularibus.*  
*pro Balbo.*  
*in Pisonem.*  
*pro Plancio.*

*pro C. Rabirio*  
*Postumo.*

*pro Milone.*

(46—43)  
*pro Marcello.*  
*pro Ligario.*  
*pro rege*  
*Deiotaro.*

*orationes*  
*Philippicae.*

of the *Philippics* proposes a public thanksgiving for the defeat of Antonius in the battle of Mutina, and the erection of a monument in honour of those who had fallen in the fight. It closes with the last recorded words spoken in public by Cicero,—*si uiui uicissent, qui morte uicerunt*.

970. Much attention has been devoted to the investigation of the rhythm of the concluding words of Cicero's periods. Zielinski's examination of all the Speeches<sup>1</sup> shows that the primary types of Cicero's *clausulae* are six in number:—

(1) <i>morte uicerunt.</i>	-- -- : --
(2) <i>cessit audaciae.</i>	-- -- : -- --
(3) <i>audeat iudicare.</i>	-- -- : -- -- --
(4) <i>spiritum pertimescerem.</i>	-- -- : -- -- -- --
(5) <i>commodis omnibus careret.</i>	-- -- : -- -- -- -- --
(6) <i>supplices uestri habere debeant.</i>	-- -- : -- -- -- -- --

All these types consist of a cretic base followed by a trochaic cadence of two or more syllables. In the last five, a molossus (— —) may be substituted for the first cretic, e.g. (2) *possem cognoscere*, (3) *decreto restitutus*, (4) *libertas uestra tollitur*, (5) *leges mutare noluerunt*, (6) *et nos existimare possumus*.

The first four types (of the two classes taken together), with their variations, occur in nearly 87 per cent. of Cicero's *clausulae*. Types 5 and 6 are comparatively rare. Of the further types the most frequent are (a) -- -- | -- -- --, (b) -- -- -- | -- -- --, (c) -- -- -- | -- -- --, e.g. (a) *consules designati*, (b) *cum gemitu ciuitatis*, (c) *postea nil audierunt*. These three make about six per cent. of the whole.

971. Cicero's earliest work on rhetoric, the treatise *De Inuentione* (c. 84), is partly founded on the *Ad Herennium*. About thirty years later, it was described by its author as unworthy of his maturer years and of his subsequent experience as an orator (*De Or.* i 5).

Rhetorical  
works.  
*De Inuentione.*

The three Books *De Oratore* (55) are in the form of a dialogue purporting to have taken place in 91 B.C. The first Book deals with the necessary preliminary studies; the second, with the treatment of the subject-matter (with a digression on the subject of wit), and the third, with diction and delivery. In their varied contents and in their admirable style, these three Books rank among the orator's most finished productions. By the author himself they were *uehementer probati* (*ad Att.* xiii 19, 4). They were followed in 46 by the *Brutus*, a dialogue on the history of Roman eloquence, with a retrospect of the author's oratorical studies; and the *Orator*, an essay on the ideal orator, with a critique on the Roman Atticists, and an excursus on rhythm. In the brief disquisition *De optimo genere oratorum*, written (about the same time) as a preface to a translation of the speeches of Aeschines and Demosthenes *On the Crown*, the perfect type of an Attic orator is found in Demosthenes. The same date may be assigned to the catechism of rhetoric called the *Partitiones Oratoriae*. The *Topica* was written in the summer of 44,

*De Oratore.*

*Brutus.*

*Orator.*

*De optimo genere oratorum.*

*Partitiones Oratoriae.*

*Topica.*

<sup>1</sup> *Clausegesetz*, Leipzig, 1904, summarised in *American Journal of Philology*, 1904, pp. 453 f, and in *Classical Review*, 1905, pp. 164 f. Cicero's system is uniform in all his writings, except the Letters to Atticus (A. C. Clark, *The Cursus*, Oxford, 1910, pp. 8, 26).

during a voyage from Velia to Regium (*Epp.* vii 19). The author had no books about him at the time, but he professes to have written out from memory a work which he describes as *Topica Aristotelea*. It has, however, practically nothing in common with Aristotle's *Topica*, but is mainly founded on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* i 15 and ii 23<sup>1</sup>.

972. Cicero's early study of philosophy was connected with his training as an orator, and it was not until his sixtieth year that he began to spend part of his enforced leisure in the hasty composition of a series of popular works founded on the speculations of the later Greek philosophers. As a lawyer, he was attracted to the New Academy, which renounced all positive definitions and was satisfied with balancing the arguments on both sides with a view to attaining a probable rather than a certain result. In ethics he was drawn to the idealism of the Stoics, while he rejected the harsher elements in their teaching. He was the first Roman to treat philosophical subjects in an elegant Latin style, and thereby to become the creator of a philosophic type of Latin prose. He also enlarged the vocabulary of Latin, and of the modern languages derived therefrom, by his admirably adequate renderings of Greek philosophical terms.

Hitherto, it was only in an uncouth type of Latin prose that Epicurus alone had been expounded among the Romans, and Cicero felt that he was doing some service to his country by applying his literary skill to the popularising of a far wider field of Greek philosophy. Practically all his philosophical works are in the form of dialogues, in which he imitates the more or less continuous expositions characteristic of Aristotle rather than the distinctly dramatic and dialectical type created by Plato. While he endeavours to commend his dialogues to his Roman readers by setting them in an attractive framework of Roman history and Roman literature, the picture itself is painted entirely with colours borrowed from Greek originals. Writing to Atticus in the year in which he composed the *De Finibus* and *Academica*, he frankly disclaims originality, calling the works on which he was then engaged merely 'copies'—'ἀπόγραφα sunt, minore labore fiunt: uerba tantum adfero, quibus abundo' (xii 52). With slight and mainly unimportant exceptions, the originals have perished, while the copies have survived, and the influence of the latter has been felt by the Latin Fathers of the Church, by the Italian humanists in the Revival of Learning, and by the English Deists and the French Revolutionists of the eighteenth century, who also appreciated Cicero as a statesman and as an orator.

Political philosophy is represented by the *De Republica* (54—51), of which only about one-third is now extant. It is a dialogue between Scipio and his friends, in which the various unmixed forms of government, of which monarchy is regarded as the best, are described in turn and dismissed, while the preference is given to a mixed constitution. In this fragmentary work there are few

<sup>1</sup> Paul Thielscher in *Philologus*, 1908, pp. 52—67.



things that are more attractive than the grave and solemn dignity of its concluding portion, *The Dream of Scipio*.

The *De Republica* was supplemented by the dialogue *De Legibus*, begun in 52, resumed in 46, and, apparently, never completed. The first Book deals with natural law; the second, with legislation and *ius sacrum*; the third, with magistrates, while the fourth was to have dealt with *iudicia*. In the third Book we incidentally learn that Cicero was opposed to the ballot, which he regarded as a cover for corrupt votes (§§ 33, 34). In the *Paradoxa Stoicorum* (46), written between the *Brutus* and the *Orator*, he dedicates to Brutus a rhetorical exposition of six of the tenets of the Stoics. This was followed by his lost treatise *De Consolatione*, inspired by the death of his daughter, and his equally lost *Hortensius* (45), an exhortation to the study of philosophy. In the first half of the same year we have the five books *De Finibus*, dealing with the teaching of the various Greek schools of philosophy on the *summum bonum*. The Epicurean doctrine is expounded in Book I, and refuted in Book II; Book III is devoted to the teaching of the Stoics, which is shown in Book IV to be in agreement with that of the Academic philosopher, Antiochus of Ascalon, while Book V sets forth the opinions of the Academics and the Peripatetics.

The same year saw the composition of the *Academica*. In its original form, the dialogue began in the villa of Catulus at Cumae, and was continued in that of Hortensius at Bauli with Lucullus as one of the principal interlocutors. The two Books of the first edition were accordingly named after *Catulus* and *Lucullus*. These two Books (the *Academica Priora*) were soon afterwards expanded into four (the *Academica Posteriora*) and dedicated to Varro, while the scene was transferred to Varro's villa at Cumae, with Varro and Cicero and Atticus for the three interlocutors. The parts now extant are the second Book of the first edition (*Lucullus*), and the first of the four Books of the second. The latter includes a sketch of Greek philosophy from Socrates to Carneades, while the former (which is later in point of subject) expounds the views of Antiochus of Ascalon, the founder of the fifth Academy, the friend of Lucullus, and the instructor of Cicero during his residence at Athens (in 79 B.C.).

In the same eventful year, 45 B.C., Cicero's villa at Tusculum was the imaginary scene of the *Tusculanae Disputationes*, a work completed in the following year. The topics treated are the wise man's contempt for death, his endurance of pain, his insensibility to sorrow, and, finally, the proof that virtue alone is sufficient for happiness. The point of view is that of the Stoic; and the discussion, which is ostensibly in the form of a dialogue, soon lapses into a monologue. The work owes much of its interest to the illustrations borrowed from Roman poetry and Roman history. Of Cicero's free translation of Plato's *Timaeus*, executed about this time, a considerable portion has been preserved.

The dialogue *De Natura Deorum*, completed in 44, purports to have taken place in 77. The author's aim is to show the value of a reasonable religion. In Book I the representative of Epicureanism gives a survey of theological opinion beginning with Thales, and ending with Diogenes of Babylon, and finally propounds the Epicurean system. In Book II we have the arguments by which the Stoic supported his belief in an active and beneficent Providence. The Epicureans are answered in Book I, and the Stoics in Book III, by the representative of the New Academy. Some of the finest passages are those in the Second Book, with its detailed review of the wonders of Nature (§§ 98—121), and its proof of the care bestowed on man by an overruling Providence (§§ 154—167).

The natural sequel to the *De Natura Deorum* is supplied by the two Books *De Divinatione* (44). In the first, Cicero's brother Quintus upholds the Stoic view that the gods make their will known to men by dreams and oracles and omens; in the second, Cicero argues, with the New Academy, that

divination is a delusion, that the fulfilment of dreams, oracles and omens is due to chance, and that true religion is opposed to superstition. Cicero's system of religious philosophy was completed by his treatise *De Fato* (44). This is an attempt to deal with the problem of free will, in which the Stoic doctrine is attacked from an Academic point of view, but it has only survived in an imperfect form.

The *Cato maior de senectute*, written in 44 B.C. and dedicated to Atticus, is in the form of a dialogue purporting to have been held in the year 150 B.C. between the younger Scipio and Laelius and Cato. Cato, whose character is skilfully drawn, delivers what is, in the main, a monologue in praise of old age. In 44 B.C. Cicero also dedicated to Atticus his *Laelius de amicitia*, a dialogue between Laelius and his sons-in-law, C. Fannius and Q. Mucius Scaevola, shortly after the death of the friend of Laelius, the younger Scipio (129). The Greek authorities followed are Theophrastus and Chrysippus, and the *Ethics* of Aristotle.

The close of Cicero's retirement from politics is marked by the publication of the three books *De Officiis*, a manual on 'moral duties' addressed to his son, who was then studying philosophy at Athens. It is largely founded on Greek models, the principal authority in Books I and II being Panaetius, and, in Book III, probably Poseidonius; but it also abounds in illustrations from Roman history<sup>1</sup>.

973. Cicero's *Letters* fall into two large divisions: I, the general correspondence (62—43 B.C.) best described as *Epistulae*. II, the special correspondence (1) *ad Atticum* (68—44 B.C.); (2) *ad Quintum fratrem* (60—54); (3) *ad Brutum* (43). There are no letters belonging to the year of Cicero's consulship.

One of Cicero's contemporaries, Cornelius Nepos, says of his *Letters to Atticus*, that 'any one who perused them would hardly need a finished history of those times' (*Att.* 16). An inordinate vanity, a quick susceptibility, and a liability to be seized and mastered by the event of the moment, have been noticed as among the most marked characteristics of his life and of his writings. In his *Speeches* we remember most vividly, not the rhetorical commonplaces or the pathetic perorations, but the inimitable way in which he tells a story or paints a portrait, and these last characteristics are still more conspicuous in the familiar style of his *Letters*. In his more intimate letters he allows himself to use the *plebeius sermo*, the *cotidiana uerba* (*Epp.* ix 21, 1). Such letters are written off-hand, on the spur of the moment; 'he always seizes the first pen he can find, and assumes it is good enough for his purpose' (*ad Quint.* ii 16, 1). His brother sees in Cicero's letters a perfect portrait of himself, 'te solum in litteris uidi' (*Epp.* xvi 16). Writing to Atticus, Cicero says: 'ego tecum tamquam mecum loquor' (viii 14, 2), and to Cassius: 'fit enim nescio qui, ut quasi coram adesse uideare, cum scribo aliquid ad te' (xv 16). Of the letters received from others, one of the most celebrated is the letter of condolence on the death of his daughter Tullia, which he received from Seruius Sulpicius, 'the Roman friend of Rome's least mortal mind' (*Epp.* iv 5).

The general correspondence was arranged by his freedman Tiro, and published in separate books. The earliest quotation is that of *Epp.* xv 19 in the *Suas.* i 5 of the elder Seneca (d. 39 A.D.). The *Letters to Atticus* were apparently published about the year 60. They are first quoted in the *Epp.* 97 and 118 of the younger Seneca (d. 65 A.D.). The younger Pliny, writing after 108, contrasts the variety and the importance of the topics open to Cicero with those open to himself (ix 2, 2). Half a century later, Fronto tells his former pupil, M. Aurelius, that all the *Letters* ought, in his opinion, to be read, even more than all the *Speeches* ('epistolae Ciceronis nihil est perfectius'), and selects from

<sup>1</sup> On Cicero's philosophical writings, see also §§ 1051—1056, 1062—1066, and Reid's *Introd. to the Academicæ*.

their pages choice passages on points of rhetoric, philosophy or politics, besides jotting down any happy phrase or any notable word. In the Revival of Learning the *Letters to Atticus*, *Brutus* and *Quintus* were recovered by Petrarch (1345), and the rest by Salutati (1392). De Quincey, whose own style is influenced by that of Cicero, finds a certain relief from the 'agitations of history' 'in the Ciceronian epistolary correspondence'. 'In this we come suddenly into deep lulls of angry passions—here, upon some scheme for the extension of literature by a domestic history, or by a comparison of Greek with Roman jurisprudence; there, again, upon some ancient problem from the quiet fields of philosophy' (*Cicero*, vi 183, ed. 1863).

The genuineness of the correspondence between Cicero and Brutus, attacked by Tunstall (1741) and Markland, was defended by Middleton, and more recently by K. F. Hermann (1844-5) and Cobet (1879). It was attacked anew by P. Meyer in 1881. The letters i 16—17 alone are rejected by some subsequent critics.

974. Gaius Julius Caesar (100—44), who received part of his early education from a native of Gaul, the accomplished Greek scholar, M. Antonius Gniphio, saw military service in Asia Minor (80), and, after his return to Rome, won renown as an orator by his prosecution of Dolabella (77). He next studied rhetoric at Rhodes; was successively quaestor (68), aedile (65), pontifex maximus (63), praetor (62), and propraetor (61f); and was associated with Pompey and Crassus in the first triumvirate (60). After his first consulship (59), he conquered Gaul as proconsul (58—50). On defeating Pompey at Pharsalia (48), he was appointed dictator, and consul for five years; he vanquished the remnant of the Pompeian forces at Thapsus (46) and Munda (45), and was assassinated on the Ides of March, 44.

Caesar.

As an orator, Caesar was surpassed by Cicero alone, being distinguished for precision, force and vigour of style, and for a fine delivery (*Cicero*, *Brutus*, 252; *Quint.* x 1, 114). It was while he was crossing the Alps on his return to Gaul, probably in the winter of 53 B.C., that he wrote the grammatical work *On Analogy*, which he dedicated to Cicero.

*De Analogia.*

It included the memorable admonition, 'ut, tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens uerbum' (*Gell.* i 10, 4). The only works that have survived are the seven Books of his *Commentarii* on the first seven years of the *Gallic War* (published 51 B.C.), and the three Books on the *Civil War*,

*De Bello Gallico.*

*De Bello Civili.*

which end with the operations at Alexandria. They hold an intermediate position between a rapidly written diary and a carefully elaborated history. Brief, perspicuous, and precise, and, to all appearance, perfectly artless and unpretentious in form, they are in fact a studiously cautious statement of the points favourable to the author, a skilful justification of his actions and his motives, described by Mommsen as 'a Military Report of the democratic general to the people from whom he had received his commission'. Cicero characterises them as plain and unadorned, adding that in history there is nothing 'pura et illustri breuitate dulcius' (*Brutus*, 262), and the latest translator of the *Gallic War* has noted 'the dignity, the terseness, the directness, the lucidity, the restraint, the masculine energy' (as well as the 'occasional roughness and carelessness') of Caesar's style. We are impressed throughout by a sense of promptitude of action and rapidity of movement. In Caesar's description of a panic among his own troops, we

find the graphic touch:—‘all over the camp men were making their wills’, followed by his own vigorous reprimand:—‘if no one else would follow him, he would go alone with the tenth legion’ (*B. G.* i 39, 40). We may here add two of his terse aphorisms:—‘fere libenter homines id quod uolunt credunt’ (*B. G.* iii 18), and ‘in bello paruis momentis magni casus intercedunt’ (*B. C.* i 21).

In the eighth Book *De Bello Gallico* the story of Caesar’s last two years in Gaul is told in a somewhat lifeless and monotonous manner by Aulus Hirtius, who testifies to the ‘ease and rapidity’ with which Caesar wrote his own *Commentarii*. The ‘Alexandrian War’, including the Illyrian war, the disturbances in Spain, and the brief campaign in Pontus, though written in a more polished style, is probably by the same author as the eighth book of the *Gallie War*. The *African War* and the *Spanish War*, with their minute details, are evidently the work of officers who had taken part in the events which they describe. The style of the former is turgid and grandiloquent, besides being marked by a frequent use of *interim* and *non intermittere*; that of the latter is awkward and uncouth, and is mainly remarkable for its curtness, while there is a rhetorical air about the speeches and the descriptions of battles.

975. The aim of Caesar and his continuators had been to produce a record of important military or political events, not to deal with history as a branch of literature. Rudeness and vigour, and an absence of polish, had characterised the style of L. Coelius Antipater (c. 120 B.C.), who was not deficient in critical faculty or in love of truth, and was among the authorities followed by Livy in the First Punic War. Some forty years later, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius (c. 78), who made short work of the fabulous period, and practically began his history with the conquest of Rome by the Gauls, paid some attention to internal affairs, and to chronology. He is quoted ten times by Livy. Gaius Licinius Macer (d. 66) surpassed his predecessors in documentary research, but he lies under the imputation of having interpolated his documents in the democratic interest. Valerius Antias, whose work has been described as ‘a historical romance of the worst type’<sup>1</sup>, sacrifices to national vanity the claims of truth. His history, which came down to the times of Sulla, is always used with caution by Livy. Cleitarchus was the model for the hybrid mixture of history and romance in which the history of the Social and the earlier Civil War was treated in an archaic style by L. Cornelius Sisenna (119–67), who receives appreciative notice in the *Iugurtha* of Sallust. Cicero, in the course of his severe criticisms on the style of all the above historians, describes Sisenna as surpassing his predecessors, though the result was only puerile. The critic himself, who was under the impression that historical composition was peculiarly appropriate for an orator, was strongly tempted to write on the recent history of Rome (*De Legibus*, i 5–9).

976. History was the field of literature chosen by Cicero’s friend, Cornelius Nepos (99–24), a countryman of Catullus, who, in dedicating his own poems to Nepos, refers to the three ‘learned and laborious’ volumes of the historian’s universal Chronicle. This must have been his earliest work, but only a few fragments have survived. His extant *Life of the elder Cato* is very brief, but it makes mention of a longer *Life* written

<sup>1</sup> Curt Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, 629.



at the request of the historian's friend and contemporary, *Atticus*, who is himself the theme of the longest of the extant biographies. The latter is extracted from the lost work, *De historicis Latinis*. The sixteen books of the comprehensive work, *De uiris illustribus*, contained a series of parallel lives of Roman and foreign celebrities. It is now represented only by the *Lives* of twenty-three foreign generals. These *Lives* are popular and even colloquial in style; they are also marked by a love of antithesis and alliteration, of rhythmical cadences and rhetorical commonplaces, but they do not attain to any high degree of historical accuracy. Among their most pointed sayings are 'paritur pax bello' (*Epam.* 5), and 'nihil in bello oportet contemni' (*Thrasyb.* 2). In the mss they are erroneously ascribed to a certain Probus, who belongs to the age of one of the two Theodosii. This error arose out of an epigram written by Probus, which, however, refers to a collection of *poems* and not to any collection of *lives*.

*Vita Attici.*

*De uiris  
illustribus.*

977. C. Sallustius Crispus (86—35) was born among the Sabine hills at Amiternum. In 52 B.C. he became a tribune of the people, and, as a partisan of Clodius, fanned the flame of popular fury against Milo and his defender, Cicero. Expelled from the Senate in 50, on the ground of his scandalous life, he was restored by Caesar, under whom he held several commands, ending with that of the navy in the African war. He remained in Africa as *propraetor* of Africa Nova (corresponding to the ancient kingdom of Numidia), where he gained the great wealth which enabled him to purchase the gardens on the Quirinal long known under his name. He devoted the leisure of the remainder of his life to the composition of historical works. He is described as 'rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor' by Tacitus, who states that Sallust adopted his sister's grandson, the Crispus Sallustius of Horace's *Odes* (II 2).

Sallust.

Sallust is now represented mainly by two historical monographs. That on the conspiracy of Catiline (*Bellum* or *Coniuratio Catilinae*) is apparently founded on personal knowledge and on hearsay, there being no trace of any indebtedness to literary documents or original authorities. It is not without chronological and historical inaccuracies, but the author aims at a strict impartiality. He treats Cicero with tact, neither over-praising nor over-blaming him, while he fully appreciates the high character of Cato, and displays a personal partiality for Caesar, taking pains to indicate that he was not implicated in the conspiracy. He touches on the general characteristics of the age and on the motives of its leading men, summing up his opinion on these and other topics with epigrammatic point. Thus he describes Catiline as 'alieni appetens, sui profusus', adding that he possessed 'satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum', while he says of Cato, 'esse quam uideri bonus malebat; ita, quo minus petebat gloriam, eo magis illum sequebatur'. His monograph on the Jugurthine War (*Bellum Iugurthinum*) has the same merits and the same defects, but is founded on more careful research, and is more even in its general plan, and more polished in its execution. The Speeches

*Bellum  
Catilinae.*

*Bellum  
Iugurthinum.*

inserted in his 'Catiline' are not historically authentic, but (like those of Thucydides) are true to the character of the speakers. His brevity and abruptness, his archaisms and his Graecisms, were noted by ancient critics. Modern writers have traced his reminiscences of Thucydides, Demosthenes, and Xenophon, and have surmised his indebtedness to Poseidonius. They have also observed a certain monotony in the forms of his sentences, due in part to the frequent recurrence of *igitur* as the first word of the clause. He repeatedly uses the historical infinitive, and is fond of rapid changes of construction, subject, and expression. For the sake of variety, he avoids symmetry of construction. His style had no influence on that of Livy<sup>1</sup>, and Seneca finds fault with his 'amputatas sententias et uerba ante expectatum cadentia et obscuram breuitatem' (*Ep.* 114, 17). But he was imitated by Tacitus, and, in a later age, admired by Fronto and by Gellius. He is the earliest scientific historian in Latin literature. His maturest work, the five books of his *Histories*, dealing with the years 78—67 B.C., is now represented only by four Speeches and two Letters, together with a considerable number of fragments. While Catullus hails Cicero as 'disertissime Romuli nepotum', Sallust in his *Histories* prefers to describe the elder Cato as 'Romani generis disertissimum', significantly adding 'multa paucis absoluit'.

978. In the prose literature of the Augustan age, the foremost place must be assigned to the historians. The immediately preceding times were commemorated in panegyrical monographs on the recent heroes of the Republic and in personal memoirs on political affairs. Even the history of the Civil Wars, *periculosae primum opus aleae*, was attempted by Asinius Pollio. But the most important prose writer of the age was Livy.

The  
Augustan  
age.

979. T. Livius (59 B.C.—17 A.D.) was born at Patavium, where he studied rhetoric and philosophy. Besides composing philosophical dialogues, he wrote for his son a treatise on rhetoric, in which he emphasised the merits of Demosthenes and Cicero, and passed an unfavourable criticism on Sallust, and also on all orators who affected an obscure and archaic style. With a view to the preparation of his History, he appears to have removed to Rome about 29—27 B.C. He enjoyed the favour of Augustus, and induced the future emperor, Claudius, to attempt historical composition. He ultimately returned to his native town, where he died at the age of 76.

Livy was over 30 years of age, when he began his History, about 27—25 B.C. (i 19, 3); and he devoted some 40 years of his life to the preparation of his great work, producing on the average three or four Books in each year. He probably proposed to complete it in 150 Books, ending with the death of Augustus (14 A.D.); he actually finished 142, ending with the death of Drusus (9 B.C.). Of this monumental achievement less than one quarter has survived, namely Books i to x, and xxi to xlv, or 35 Books in all, covering the two periods of 753 to 293, and

<sup>1</sup> Quint. x 1, 102, 'immortalem Sallusti uelocitatem diuersis uirtutibus consecutus est'.

218 to 167 B.C. An early abridgement of the whole is mentioned by Martial:—‘*Pellibus exiguis artatur Liuius ingens, | quem mea non totum bibliotheca capit*’ (xiv 190).

The lost Books are represented by a fragment on the Sertorian war, from Book xci, and by a few others, including two passages on Cicero, preserved by the elder Seneca (*Suas.* 6, 17 and 22). Under the title of *Periochae*, there are outlines of all the Books except 136 and 137; an independent epitome of the history of 150—137 B.C. is published in vol. iv of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*; the portents were abstracted by Iulius Obsequens and the abstract for 190—12 B.C. is still extant; lastly, Livy is the principal source of the list of consuls given in the Chronicle of Cassiodorus.

Even during the lifetime of the historian, his fame was so widely extended that a traveller was impelled by ‘the glory of his name’ to undertake a journey to Rome from the western limits of Spain, simply to see him and then to return (Plin. *Epp.* ii 38). His summaries of the lives and characters of the heroes of his history are lauded by the elder Seneca, who describes him as ‘*candidissimus omnium magnorum ingeniorum aestimator*’ (*Suas.* vi 21); he is recognised by Tacitus as ‘*eloquentiae ac fidei praeclarus in primis*’ (*Ann.* iv 34); his ‘*mira facundia*’ is noticed by Quintilian (viii 1, 3), who also praises the charm and the perspicuity of his narrative, the marvellous eloquence of his speeches, and the appropriateness of his diction, with its perfect representation of the whole range of human emotion (x 1, 101). Elsewhere, he contrasts the conciseness of Sallust with the *lactea ubertas*, the succulent richness, of Livy (*ib.* 32).

Livy does not quote any authorities earlier than Fabius Pictor, who wrote in Greek and belonged to the sixth century of Rome. The *annales maximi*, recorded by the *pontifex maximus* and preserved in the temple of Iuno Moneta, are quoted by Fabius, but not by Livy. Seldom has a historian been so little of an antiquarian. Aelius Tubero and Licinius Macer quote the *libri lintei* for two different accounts of the consuls of 434 B.C.; Livy mentions both accounts, but does not consult the *libri* (iv 23, 2—3). The terms of the earliest treaty between Rome and Carthage are preserved by Polybius, who (probably erroneously) ascribes it to 509 B.C.; Livy mentions three later treaties, but does not state their terms. An inscription relating to the property of Sp. Cassius, cited second-hand by Livy (ii 41, 10), was actually seen by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Livy has not consulted the treaties with Gabii (i 54, 10) and Ardea (iv 7, 10), or the *lex Icilia de Aventino publicando* (iii 31, 1), inscribed (as Dionysius tells us) in the temple of Diana on the Aventine. When Augustus, who was much more of an antiquarian, examined in the half-ruined temple of Jupiter Feretrius the *spolia opima* won by C. Cossus from the king of Veii, and stated that, on the linen tunic, he saw the name of Cossus inscribed as consul (while all the authorities had made him a military tribune at the time of his exploit), Livy merely quotes the two views and leaves his readers to hazard the conjecture that Augustus may have made a mistake (iv 20). It is quite an exception for him to quote an archaic formula, such as that used by Decius in devoting himself to death (viii 9); and, regardless of the expectations of future historians of Latin literature, he neglects to record the text of the ancient hymn composed in 207 B.C. by Liuius Andronicus (xxvii 37).

His attitude towards his authorities is indicated in various parts of his work. He confesses to a certain hesitation in weighing their evidence (viii 40); in the absence of certainty, he is sometimes willing to follow mere tradition (vii 6); of all the conflicting accounts of the death of Marcellus, he chooses the version given by the majority (xxvii 27). In the first decade, his exact relation to his authorities is impossible to ascertain, since those authorities are no longer extant. But it seems clear that, in that decade, he adheres to the later rather than to the earlier annalists; that, in other words, he follows Valerius Antias, Licinius Macer, Aelius Tubero, and Claudius Quadrigarius, in preference to Fabius Pictor and Calpurnius Piso. It is fairly obvious that in Books i—iv he follows the first three of the above writers, and that, in Books v—x, he adds Claudius

Quadrigarius to his list<sup>1</sup>. In the third decade, his main authorities for the Second Punic War are Coelius Antipater and Polybius, but some critics doubt whether Livy made any direct use of Polybius in Books xxi—xxii, and defer his direct indebtedness to Book xxiii or xxiv. It is not until the end of this decade that he is actually mentioned as 'Polybius, haudquaquam spernendus auctor' (xxx 45). In the narrative of the wars in the East, given in the fourth and fifth decades, he follows the Greek historian much more closely, now abridging, and now amplifying him; and he here uses a fuller phrase of acknowledgement,—'nos Polybium secuti sumus, non incertum auctorem cum omnium Romanorum rerum tum praecipue in Graecia gestarum' (xxxiii 10, 10). Hence his account of affairs in Greece has a certain unity, which is absent from that of the internal history of Rome, where the historian is following two conflicting authorities, Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias. In point of style, in vividness and dramatic skill, Livy is distinctly superior to Polybius<sup>2</sup>; and, even when the Roman historian is translating his Greek original, 'how satisfying to the ear and taste are the periods of Livy when he is putting into Latin the heavy and uncouth clauses of Polybius'<sup>3</sup>. Livy's style has, in fact, been described as 'on the whole perhaps the greatest prose style written in any age or language'<sup>4</sup>.

With the possible exception of the Alps, which were not far from his home, he took no pains to visit the countries whose history he describes, being in this respect less enterprising than Polybius and Diodorus. He has been denounced by a modern historian as 'profoundly ignorant of Italian geography'<sup>5</sup>, and he has been attacked for a not unnatural vagueness as to the boundaries of the Volsci, the Aedui and the Marsi (iv 57; x 1), and as to the topography of Syracuse (xxv 30). He indulges in a rhetorical eulogy on the climate of Rome, and tells us that the Gallic invaders found it impossible to bear the heat of the Italian sun, but he has nothing to say on the general influence of climate on history<sup>6</sup>.

He has also been attacked on the ground of mistakes in his renderings from the Greek, and for other inaccuracies, and even for distinct contradictions. Thus, he gives two different versions of the same event, without betraying any consciousness of the fact; the war with the Aurunci is told twice over (ii 16 f and 25 f); Pometia is destroyed in ii 17, 6, but its siege and capture are related once more in c. 25, 5. He is sometimes careless in his chronology. He had no personal experience of public life, and therefore no special aptitude for understanding politics. Augustus, who recognised him as a partisan of the Pompeians, continued to patronise him as a patriotic historian, who was not politically dangerous. In the judgement of Caligula, he was 'wordy and careless', *verbosus et neglegens*<sup>7</sup>. He is not an expert in military matters. Hence his narrative fails to give a perfectly clear account of the progress of any single battle, or of the general course of any extensive strategical operations.

His aim was to produce a comprehensive history of his country in a style which, in point of eloquence and pictorial pomp, was bound to prove a source of pleasure and pride to his fellow-countrymen. Among his qualifications for this task, he had a keenly patriotic enthusiasm, a vivid imagination, and a rich and varied vocabulary. His speeches are masterpieces of rhetorical and psychological skill. The speech of Hanno, in favour of delivering Hannibal into the hands of the Romans, may be mentioned as a striking example (xxi 10).

History has been described by Cicero as an *opus oratorium* (*De Legibus*, i 5) and by Quintilian as a *carmen solutum*. In view of such descriptions, we cannot be surprised at the poetic colouring of Livy's prose, or at his distinctly oratorical treatment of his theme. His periods are much more complicated with subordinate clauses than those

<sup>1</sup> Claudius began his *Annals* with the capture of Rome in 394 B.C. (Livy, v 40—43).

<sup>2</sup> M. Taine (*Tite Live*, 278—287) well compares their accounts of Hannibal crossing the Alps.

<sup>3</sup> Munro, *Lucr.* 306<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Munro, *Elucidations of Catullus*, 230.

<sup>5</sup> Ihne's *History of Rome*, i 404 n.

<sup>6</sup> Cp. M. Taine, *l.c.*, p. 70.

<sup>7</sup> Suetonius, *Caligula*, 34.



of Cicero. While Cicero, as a practical orator, aimed at making his meaning clear to an audience that could only hear each sentence once, Livy, though oratorical in style, writes for a reader who can always re-read any sentence that he fails to understand<sup>1</sup>. In the rhetorical art, as well as in the poetic colour of his style, he keeps to the 'golden mean', and, while he stands between the 'golden' and the 'silver' age of Latin prose, he combines many of the merits of both.

980. Q. Asconius Pedianus (c. 3—88 A.D.), who was certainly acquainted with Livy, and was, like Livy, born at Patavium, is now best known as the author of a learned historical commentary on Cicero's Speeches, composed about 55 A.D. Of this commentary the only surviving portions deal with the speeches in *Pisonem*, *pro Scauro*, *pro Milone*, *pro Cornelio*, and *in toga candida*. The work abounds in historical and antiquarian lore.

Asconius.

981. It was a contemporary of Livy who composed the first universal history in the Latin language, beginning with the Assyrians, Medes and Persians, continuing with the Scythians and Greeks, and ending with the history of early Rome and of Gaul and Spain down to the conquest of the Cantabri in the age of Augustus. Its author was Pompeius Trogus, a native of Gallia Narbonensis, whose father had served under Iulius Caesar. It was founded on Greek originals, either solely on Timāgenes of Alexandria (mentioned by Horace, *Epp.* i 19, 15, and Quint. x 1, 75), or on a series of earlier Greek historians, Dinon, Ephorus, Theopompus, Timaeus, Phylarchus, Polybius, Clitarchus, and Poseidonius. Hugo de Fleury, c. 1091 (probably following a lost work of Suetonius), assigns its completion to the year 9 A.D.

Pompeius  
Trogus

982. It is now represented solely in a synopsis of the 44 Books, and in an abridgement drawn up by Justin (M. Iunianus Iustinus), who describes his own work as 'breue uelut florum corpusculum'. Justin's date is uncertain. He may have lived either in the middle of the second century, or in the third.

abridged by  
Justin.

983. The long life of Annaeus Seneca, the elder, fills nearly the whole of the 8th century A.U.C. (54 B.C.—39 A.D.). He was born at Corduba, and twice visited Rome, where his stay was long enough to admit of his becoming intimate with the Roman rhetoricians of the time. Of his three sons, the eldest was the Gallio of the *Acts* (xviii 12), the second was Seneca the philosopher, while the third was the father of Lucan.

The elder  
Seneca.

Seneca's work consists of *Controuersiae* and *Suasoriae*, the former being discussions on moot points of equity, the latter, deliberations on alternative courses of action, e.g., 'Shall Agamemnon sacrifice Iphigenia?', 'Shall Alexander embark on the Ocean?', 'Shall Cicero apologise to Antonius?'. The prefaces to the several books of *Controuersiae* (so far as they have survived) are better worth reading than the rest. They include characteristic sketches of the leading rhetoricians of the day. Then follows the *Controuersia* under three headings: (1) *Sententiae*, or opinions of the several rhetoricians on the general application of the law to the case under

<sup>1</sup> Cp. Madvig, *Kl. Philol. Schriften*, 356 f.

consideration; (2) *Diuisiones*, or detailed questions arising out of the subject; (3) *Colores*, or 'colourable' representations of the act under discussion. There are numerous digressions, varied with anecdotes, and with criticisms on individual orators. These are in general sober and severe; the author has a special admiration for Cicero, recalling the fact that, in his younger days, he had heard all the great orators except Cicero, whom he was only prevented from hearing by being detained in Spain during the Civil War. In the *Suasoriae* (vi 24) he has preserved the striking passage in which Asinius Pollio sums up the orator's character:—

'huius uiri tot tantisque operibus mansuris in omne aeuum praedicare de ingenio atque industria superuacuum est.... Utinam moderatus secundas res et fortius aduersas ferre potuisset'.

Elsewhere, in the course of the *Controuersiae*, we find the phrases, 'in Cicerone constantia...desideratur', and 'Ciceronem eloquentia sua in carminibus destituit' (ii 4; iii 8). The Latinity of the Silver Age shows itself less in the prefaces than in the body of the work. The arguments set forth in the latter throw some light on the Roman method of instruction in rhetoric, but the work as a whole has no special value as literature.

984. It is almost universally held that Augustus is the *Imperator Caesar* to whom Vitruuius dedicates the ten Books of his treatise on Architecture. The first seven treat of temples and private houses; the 8th of aqueducts; the 9th of sundials; and the 10th of engines of war. The author's skill in this last department of his profession was specially recognised by the emperor (*Præf.* i 2), while at Fanum Fortunae (where a triumphal arch is still standing in honour of Augustus, the founder of the 'Colonia Iulia Fanestris'), Vitruuius was the architect of the Basilica (v 1, 6). The author bespeaks the emperor's indulgence by pleading that he writes neither as a rhetorician, nor as a man of letters, nor as a philosopher, but simply as an architect (i 1, 17). Nevertheless, he is proud of his profession. Like the elder Pliny, he owes much to the lost *Disciplinae* of Varro, and we may thus account for the fact that his prefaces are of more than professional interest. His style is apt to oscillate between undue brevity and undue diffuseness, and is sometimes affected, sometimes plebeian. He constantly uses *is*; hardly ever *ille*. His fondness for the use of the plural of abstract substantives, and for prepositions instead of oblique cases, is among the points that have led to the work being assigned to the third or fifth century; but it is quoted by the elder Pliny (among the authorities for Books xvi, xxxv f), and by Frontinus (*De Aquis*, 25). The author has not been disappointed of his hope that his work might descend to posterity, but the drawings which originally accompanied it have not survived.

985. The age of Tiberius is marked by two of the minor historians of Rome. C. Velleius Paterculus (c. 19 B.C.—31 A.D.), who was possibly of Campanian origin, saw service under Tiberius in Germany, and took part in the triumph of 12 A.D.

The age of  
Tiberius:  
Velleius  
Paterculus.

His work is an abridgement of Roman history in two Books, the first ending with the destruction of Carthage and Corinth in 146 B.C., and the second closing with 30 A.D., in the consulship of M. Vinicius, to whom the work is dedicated. The former includes an excursus on the Roman Colonies, and the latter, one on the Roman Provinces. Among Velleius' authorities are Cato's *Origines* and Cornelius Nepos, while the fact that he was writing under imperial patronage may have led him to mistrust Livy as a republican in disguise. His work is marred by excessive flattery of Tiberius. In his chronology he is inconsistent, following now Varro and now Cato, and sometimes neither. He makes many mistakes, and his study of history is far from profound. In his rapid sketch of the past, the personal element is more prominent than the general march of events, while, in his reminiscences of his own campaigns, he is extraordinarily vivid. His style is affected and artificial; his sentences clumsy, and cumbered with parentheses; his vocabulary meagre, and his general phraseology pompous and redundant, while the haste with which his work was composed leads to his frequently lapsing into colloquialisms. In his love of point and epigram he is, however, an early representative of the Silver Age. In his antitheses and in his brief sentences, which take the place of the fully developed period, he betrays the influence of the schools of declamation. In his studied artificiality he may be regarded as an imitator of Sallust, to whom, however, he is intellectually inferior. A redeeming feature may be found in his interest in the history of literature. He refers to Hesiod (i 7, 1) and the Greek drama (i 16, 3), and, in the course of his brief remarks on the Latin poets and historians (ii 9, 2—5, and 36, 2—3), specially mentions Sallust as the 'emulator of Thucydides'.

986. It was to the emperor Tiberius that Valerius Maximus dedicated the collection of historical Anecdotes known as the *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem*. Here, as in the history of Velleius, the emperor is the theme of the most abject adulation. Of the author's life nothing is known beyond the fact that he visited Asia in the company of Sextus Pompeius, the friend of Ovid, and the proconsul of Asia between 27 and 30 A.D. (ii 6, 8). The preface to Book vi was written before the death of Liuia (29 A.D.), and a passage in Book ix (11, *ext.* 4) after the death of Seianus (31). The Anecdotes are intended for the use of speakers, and are classified under various topics, each of these being illustrated from Roman and (less fully) from foreign sources. The principal authorities are Livy and Caesar, also Varro, and possibly Valerius Antias and Pompeius Trogus. In quoting memorable sayings, the author usually keeps close to his authorities, any alteration being due to a desire for rhetorical effect. In the order of the words there is much mannerism. The vocabulary is generally pure, the phraseology declamatory, and the style turgid. The orator is lavish in the use of metaphors, but his manner is apt to be monotonous. His work was abridged by Iulius Paris (c. 400 A.D.) and by Ianuarius Nepotianus (before 600 A.D.), and was highly popular in the Middle Ages.

Valerius  
Maximus.

987. The rhetorical historian, Q. Curtius Rufus, may be identified with the rhetorician of that name mentioned in Suetonius, *De Curtius*. *rhetoribus*, immediately after M. Porcius Latro, who died c. 750 A.U.C. Curtius is the author of a history of Alexander the Great in ten Books, of which the first two have not survived. One of his principal Greek authorities is Cleitarchus, c. 300 B.C. (ix 8, 15), but, for his knowledge of that historian, he is possibly indebted to Timāgēnes, 55 B.C. (ix 5, 21). He does not claim to be a historical critic:—‘plus transcribo quam credo’ (ix 1, 34). He makes short work of the duller incidents in his narrative, while he expatiates on those that are more picturesque. His speeches are elaborate without being specially characteristic of the speakers; the letters imbedded in his history are also composed in a rhetorical spirit; and he shows little technical knowledge in his descriptions of battles. His fatalism is indicated by his reference to *inevitabile fatum* (iv 6, 17); he protests against superstition, which he describes as *humanarum mentium ludibrium* (vii 7, 8); and he characterises flattery as the *perpetuum malum regum* (viii 5, 6). His language, which resembles that of Livy, is free from the faults of the fashionable rhetoric of his day. His work may be ascribed to the early part of the reign of Claudius, whose accession (in 41 A.D.) he welcomes as the rising of the sun after the *caligo* of Caligula (x 9, 3—6). Two or three passages of his history appear to be quoted, without mention of his name, in the *Letters* of Seneca (cp. vii 1, 4 and 3, 5; viii 10, 29; and *Epp.* 56, 9; 59, 12).

988. The earliest extant Latin work on geography is the *De Chorographia* of Pomponius Mela, a native of the Spanish town of Tingentera (ii 96). His date may be determined by the passage (iii 49) beginning ‘tam diu *clausam* (Britanniam) aperit ecce principum maximus’, possibly a reference to Claudius (44). His authorities include Cornelius Nepos, and Hanno, probably in both cases cited at second-hand. He is frequently quoted, by name, by the elder Pliny, and, without it, by Solinus. His work is of no great compass, but it is excellently arranged and is very complete, the number of geographical names recorded exceeding 1500. It is written in a rhetorical style suggestive of the influence of Sallust. The dry geographical statistics, which render it an ‘opus impeditum et facundiae minime capax’ (i 1), are occasionally relieved by rhetorical descriptions, such as those of Egypt and Britain, of Mount Ida, and the Corycian cave in Cilicia.

989. It was probably under the rule of Tiberius that a comprehensive encyclopaedia of agriculture, medicine, war, rhetoric, jurisprudence and philosophy was compiled by A. Cornelius Celsus. His treatise on agriculture is quoted 30 times, in the most respectful terms, by his younger contemporary Columella. Quintilian infers the possibility of acquiring all the branches of learning useful to the orator from the fact that even Celsus, *mediocri uir ingenio*, had written, not only on rhetoric, philosophy, and jurisprudence, but also on war and



agriculture and medicine, and might fairly be credited with a knowledge of all these subjects (xii 11, 24). Elsewhere, he repeatedly criticises the treatise on rhetoric, and, in the spirit of a specialist, bestows only faint praise on his predecessor's encyclopaedic erudition. The encyclopaedia began with five Books on agriculture, followed by eight on medicine, the only part that is still extant. (Cp. § 1081.)

The author was not engaged in the profession of medicine, but had practical experience of the art as a head of a household, and he has definite opinions, which are founded on personal knowledge (e.g. iii 4, 11, 24 etc.). His Greek authorities are mainly Hippocrates and Asclepiades; he has also preserved the names of as many as 72 writers on medicine whose works are now lost. After an excellent introduction on the leading schools of medicine, he deals with dietetics (i), with the lore of symptoms and of therapeutics (ii), with internal maladies (iii, iv), pharmacology (v, vi), and surgery (vii, viii). In his preface he points out the value of a study of natural science as a preparation for the study of medicine. His style is pure and simple, and free from all rhetorical artificiality or exaggeration. With the obvious exception of the details of his prescriptions, his work is eminently readable, and the author's individuality comes home to us from time to time, as when he says that the greatness of Hippocrates was proved by his frankly confessing he had once mistaken the suture of the skull for a fracture:—'nam leuia ingenia, quia nihil habent, nihil sibi detrahunt: magno ingenio, multaque nihilominus habituro, conuenit etiam simplex ueri erroris confessio' (viii 4).

990. We still possess the whole of the treatise on agriculture written by Columella. The fact that he was a native of Gades is proved by his mentioning a variety of lettuce as 'mea, quam generant Tartessi litore Gades' (x 185). Columella. His uncle was an 'accomplished and indefatigable agriculturist' in the Spanish province of Baetica (ii 16, 4; v 5, 15; vii 2, 4). In an inscription from Tarentum Columella is described in full as L. Iunius Moderatus Columella, a tribune of the sixth legion (C. I. L. ix 235), which was stationed in Syria; thus it was on military service that he visited Syria and Cilicia (ii 10, 18). He possessed land in Latium, near Ardea (iii 9, 2). Seneca (who died in 65 A.D.) was still living when Columella wrote of the property near Nomentum then owned by Seneca, 'uir excellentis ingenii atque doctrinae' (iii 3, 3). His treatise *de Re Rustica* is in twelve Books; the tenth, which is written in verse, aims at filling the gap left in the *Fourth Georgic* by Virgil's declining to sing of gardens (cp. § 936), while the eleventh and twelfth Books are added by an afterthought (xi 1, 2). Part of an earlier and briefer treatise by the same author is preserved in the single Book *De Arboribus*, which covers the same ground as Books iii—v of the larger work. The author has a keen interest in his subject and is fully conscious of the dignity and the importance of agriculture. He has studied it with diligence and has treated it in a refined and appropriate style, which has made it a classic in its own department. He has had ample experience of his own, besides carefully consulting the writings of the elder Cato, of Varro, Saserna, Tremellius Scrofa, Hyginus, Iulius Atticus, Cornelius Celsus and Iulius Graecinus, as well as those of the Carthaginian Mago. His own work is comparatively little quoted, even by the elder Pliny; but he is the main authority followed in the fourth century by Palladius.

991. L. Annaeus Seneca (c. 4 B.C.—65 A.D.), the second son of the rhetorician, Annaeus Seneca, was born at Corduba. At an early age he was taken to Rome by his mother's sister, and was there educated under Fabianus Papirius, and Sotion, the Pythagorean of Alexandria, both of whom were followers of the practical philosopher, Sextius. He also studied under the great Stoic, Attalus. By the advice of Attalus, he abjured many of the ordinary enjoyments of life (Ep. 108, 13—16), and, at the suggestion of Sotion, abstained for a year from the use of meat, but his father put a stop to this form of abstinence, which was popularly associated

Seneca.

with foreign superstitions (*ib.* §§ 17—23). At the fall of Seianus in 31 A.D., Seneca was still in Rome (*N. Q.* i 1, 3). After a visit to Egypt, he returned in 32, and began to practise at the bar (*Ep.* 109, 2). Before the death of Tiberius in 37, he had filled the office of quaestor. As a senator, he incurred the jealousy of Claudius, and in 39 narrowly escaped being put to death. In 41 he was banished to Corsica, where he devoted himself to the study of literature and science (*ad Helviam*, 20, 1). He was recalled in 49 and, by the influence of Agrippina, appointed tutor to Nero (*Tac. Ann.* xii 8; *Suet. Nero* 7). At this period he was in the enjoyment of great influence and of vast wealth; he had many estates, and lent large sums of money to persons abroad, even in distant Britain. By his first wife he had three sons; he married his second wife in 57, the year in which he was *consul suffectus*. In 62 he withdrew in part from public life (*Tac. Ann.* xiv 52); three years later he was charged with being implicated in the conspiracy of Piso, and was compelled by Nero's orders to put himself to death (*ib.* xv 62).

The extant prose works of Seneca fall into four groups according as they were composed, (1) before his exile in 41, (2) during his exile (41—49), (3) between his recall and his retirement (49—62), and (4) between his retirement and his death (62—65). On his poetical works, see § 930.

Before 41 A.D.	49—62 A.D.	62—65 A.D.
<i>Consolatio ad Marciam.</i>	<i>De breuitate uitae.</i>	<i>De otio.</i>
<i>De ira.</i>	( <i>Apocolocyntosis.</i> )	<i>De uita beata</i> (58 or 62).
	<i>De clementia.</i>	<i>De prouidentia.</i>
41—49 A.D.	<i>De constantia sapientis.</i>	<i>Naturales quaestiones.</i>
<i>Consolatio ad Helviam.</i>	<i>De tranquillate animi.</i>	<i>Epistolae morales</i>
<i>Consolatio ad Polybium.</i>	<i>De beneficiis</i> (?).	(begun in 57).

992. Of the prose works twelve have come down to us in a collected *Corpus* primarily preserved in the Ambrosian MS. Owing to the frequent introduction of an imaginary interlocutor, implied by terms such as *inquis* or *dicet aliquis*, these twelve works are known as *Dialogi*. Their titles and subjects are as follows:—

(1) *ad Lucilium de prouidentia*; (2) *ad Serenum de constantia sapientis*; (3)—(5) *ad Nouatum de ira*; (6) *ad Marciam*, written before 41 A.D. to condole with the daughter of Cremutius Cordus on the death of her son; (7) *ad Gallionem de uita beata*, written to justify a philosopher's possession of wealth, and dedicated to the author's brother, the Gallio of the *Acts*; (8) *ad Serenum de otio*, written c. 62 A.D., discussing whether a philosopher ought to take part in public affairs; (9) *ad Serenum de tranquillitate animi*, c. 49 A.D.; (10) *ad Paulinum de breuitate uitae*, 49 A.D.; (11) *ad Polybium de consolatione*; (12) *ad Helviam matrem de consolatione*. Both of these last were written during his exile with a view to promoting his recall. (11) is prompted by the death of the brother of Polybius, the secretary of Claudius, and is full of flattery of the reigning emperor.

The *Apocolocyntōsis* (or 'pumpkinification', a parody of *Apotheosis*) *Diui Claudii* is a political satire written soon after the emperor's death in 54 A.D. In its combination of verse and prose it follows the tradition of Varro's *Saturae Menippeae* (§ 962).

Two of the three books *De clementia* are still extant. They were written when Nero was twenty-two years of age (55—6 A.D.), with the purpose of showing the public the kind of education he had received from Seneca. The references to the emperor's 'clemency' were doubtless true at the time when they were written.

Of the seven books *De beneficiis* the first four were probably published separately soon after 54 A.D., and the rest at a later date.

993. The seven books of *Naturales Quaestiones* are dedicated c. 62—63 A.D. to Seneca's young friend Lucilius, the procurator of Sicily, sometimes supposed to be the author of the poem on *Aetna* (§ 938). The work is mainly derived from Stoic sources, and in particular from Poseidonius. It gives proof of more knowledge than we find in the corresponding parts of the work of the elder Pliny. It was used in the Middle Ages as a standard text-book of physical science<sup>1</sup>.

994. The *Epistulae morales ad Lucilium* consist of 124 Letters arranged in 20 books. They are epigrammatic and discursive moral essays in the guise of letters.

They were begun in 57 A.D. and were written, from the first, with a view to publication (*Ep.* 21, 5), but probably not published until after the author's death. The order of the letters is approximately chronological.

995. Seneca's writings are mainly concerned with philosophy on its practical side; and, even in his discussions of natural phenomena, the moral element is conspicuous. He cares little for mere learning that has no bearing on life; he ridicules the pursuit of curious or antiquarian details (*De brev. vitae*, 13); he even criticises historians for dealing with events which have actually taken place, instead of things that ought to happen (*N. Q.* 3 praef.). His views on the providence of God and on the brotherhood of man breathe an almost Christian spirit.

The fourteen letters purporting to be the correspondence between Seneca and St Paul are spurious, though they were accepted as genuine by Jerome: 'Seneca...quem non ponerem in catalogo sanctorum, nisi me epistulae illae procurarent, quae leguntur a plurimis, Pauli ad Senecam et Senecae ad Paulum' (*De uiris illustribus*, 12).

The fullest account of Seneca's training in the Stoic philosophy is to be found in *Ep.* 108; he accepts that philosophy in general terms (*Ep.* 113, 117), without binding himself exclusively to it (*Ep.* 45, 'nullius nominis fui'). Later in life he came under the influence of Demetrius the Cynic (*Ep.* 62, 3), whom he follows in his fatalism (*De prov.* 5, 7)<sup>2</sup>. He condemned the inhuman butcheries practised in the Roman arena (*Ep.* 95, 33), and in this respect doubtless had a salutary influence on the conduct of Nero (58 A.D.; Tac. *Ann.* xiii 31). He professes to be, not the slave of his wealth, but its master.

On matters of style, he notices the conflicting opinions of his age, 'de compositione non constat' (*Ep.* 100, 6); 'oratio certam regulam non habet' (113, 13). He is himself the theme of a well-known criticism by Quintilian (x 1, 125—131), and Tacitus has recognised his 'ingenium amoenum et temporis eius auribus accommodatum' (*Ann.* xiii 3).

The terse and epigrammatic style of Seneca stands in sharp contrast with the ample and periodic style of Cicero. In Seneca the Ciceronian period is broken up into what Quintilian describes as *minutissimae sententiae* (x 1, 130). He is the most conspicuous writer of the age of Caligula, Claudius, and Nero,—an age in which brilliancy was more highly esteemed than a natural simplicity and sobriety of language. His style was acutely criticised by Caligula as 'sand without mortar', implying a want of compactness in his imperfectly connected sentences (Suet. *Cal.* 53). His manner of writing is constantly characterised by piquancy and point, but his love of epigram palls perhaps on the reader who peruses large portions of his works at a single stretch; and he seems at his best when taken in small doses. He positively shines in single sentences, and few ancient authors have so many eminently quotable passages, which lose little (if anything) by being detached from their immediate context. The following are a few specimens:—'Quam angusta innocentia est, ad legem bonum esse' (*De ira*, ii 27). 'Qui dedit beneficium taceat; narret qui accepit' (*De ben.* ii 11). 'Non exiguum temporis habemus, sed multum perdimus' (*ib.* i, 3). 'Vivere tota uita discendum est, et, quod magis fortasse miraberis, tota uita discendum est mori' (*ib.* 7, 4). 'Multo satius est paucis auctoribus te tradere, quam errare per multos' (*De Tranq.* 9). 'Non refert quam multos libros, sed

<sup>1</sup> E. T. by John Clarke, *Physical Science in the Time of Nero*, with notes by Sir Archibald Geikie, 1910.

<sup>2</sup> On Seneca's philosophy, see § 1067 *infra*.

quam bonos habeas; lectio certa prodest, uaria delectat' (*Ep.* 45). 'Talis hominum est oratio qualis uita' (114). 'Si uis amari, ama' (9). 'Sic uiue cum hominibus, tanquam Deus videat; sic loquere cum Deo, tanquam homines audiant' (10). 'Membra sumus corporis magni' (95). 'Non sentire mala sua non est hominis, et non ferre non est uiri' (*Cons. ad Polyb.* 36, 2). 'Quam bene uiues refert, non quam diu' (*Ep.* 101). 'Homines dum docent discunt' (7). 'Longum iter est per praecepta, breue et efficax per exempla' (6).

Many of his terse sentences found their way into *Florilegia* and *Excerpta*, which were highly popular in the Middle Ages. After the Revival of Learning, his works attracted the attention of Lipsius and Gronovius. They were especially popular in France, where they became the theme of a notable essay by Diderot (1772)<sup>1</sup>.

996. Gaius Petronius, once proconsul of Bithynia, was afterwards consul in Rome, where he either 'lapsed into the habit or assumed the mask of vice' (Tac.).  
**Petronius.** An expert in the art of luxury, he became *elegantiae arbiter* at the court of Nero. He thus aroused the jealousy of Tigellinus, and in 66 A.D. found himself compelled to commit suicide at Cumae (Tac. *Ann.* xvi 18, 19).

Gaius Petronius has been rightly identified as the author of the satiric novel which has come down to us in a fragmentary form under the name of Petronius Arbiter. It professes to recount the strange adventures experienced by one Encolpius in the course of his travels. As the troubles of Odysseus are due to the wrath of Poseidon, so those of this Greek freedman are attributed to the resentment of Priapus (139). The extant portions belong mainly to Books xv and xvi. The satire follows the model of the primitive *Satura Menippea* in being written in prose blended with passages of verse. Literary criticism is represented in the opening protest against the bombastic language due to the practice of declamation. The *declamatores* are here addressed as follows:—

'pace uestra liceat dixisse, primi omnium eloquentiam perdidistis. Ieuius enim atque inanibus sonis ludibria quaedam excitando effecistis, ut corpus orationis eneruaretur et caderet. nondum iuuenes declamationibus continebantur, cum Sophocles aut Euripides inuenerunt uerba, quibus deberent loqui. nondum umbraticus doctor ingenia deleuerat, cum Pindarus nouemque lyriici Homerici uersibus canere timuerunt. et ne poëtas [quidem] ad testimonium citem, certe neque Platona neque Demosthenen ad hoc genus exercitationis accessisse uideo. grandis et ut ita dicam pudica oratio non est maculosa nec turgida, sed naturali pulchritudine exsurgit. nuper uentosa istaec et enormis loquacitas Athenas ex Asia commigravit animosque iuuenum ad magna surgentes ueluti pestilenti quodam sidere afflauit, semelque corrupta regula eloquentia stetit et obmutuit. ad summam, quis postea Thucydidis, quis Hyperidis ad famam processit? ac ne carmen quidem sani coloris enituit, sed omnia quasi eodem cibo pasta non potuerunt usque ad senectutem canescere' (§ 2).

Literary criticism is also exemplified in a later passage warning the poet against allowing any particular passage to be too obtrusive for its context, insisting on the use of choice language and the avoidance of vulgarity, and justifying this view by appealing to Homer and Virgil, as well as the Greek lyric poets and Horace with (what is here happily described as) his *curiosa felicitas*.

<sup>1</sup> See also the Introductions to *Select Letters of Seneca*, ed. Summers, 1910.



'ceteri enim aut non uiderunt uiam, qua iretur ad carmen, aut uisam timuerunt calcare. ecce belli ciuilis ingens opus quisquis attigerit, nisi plenus literis, sub onere labetur. non enim res gestae uersibus comprehendendae sunt, quod longe melius historici faciunt, sed per ambages deorumque ministeria et fabulosum sententiarum tormentum praecipitandus est liber spiritus, ut potius furentis animi uaticinatio appareat quam religiosae orationis sub testibus fides: tanquam si placet hic impetus, etiam si nondum recepit ultimam manum' (§ 118).

Then follows a poem consisting of 295 hexameters *De Bello Ciuili*, which is sometimes represented as a parody of Lucan, but, as is clear from the preceding context, is best regarded as a specimen of a different method of handling the same subject. The *Troiae Halōsis*, in 65 *senarii* on the Fall of Troy (§ 89), is supposed to be a parody of Nero's poem of the same name. In other passages we have parodies of Seneca.

Prose alone is the medium used in the longer episodes. The story of the 'Ephesian matron' (§§ 111 f), also found in Phaedrus (*Appendix*, xiii), is probably derived from the old 'Milesian fables', and has even been traced to India and China. The longest and most important is the *Cena Trimalchionis*, preserved solely in a MS found at Trau in Dalmatia about 1650. It supplies us with a long and elaborate description of a sumptuous dinner, at which Encolpius and his companions are entertained by a rich and vulgar freedman. The scene of the repast is a 'Greek town' (81) on or near the bay of Naples, which is also a 'Roman colony' (44), and has magistrates called 'praetors' (65). The scene of another part of the narrative is laid at Croton.

The dramatic date of the romance is probably early in the reign of Nero. It is one of the most remarkable products of the imperial age. The characters taking part in it are powerfully and vigorously drawn. Trimalchio is the vulgar upstart; Eumolpus, the typical poetaster; while Encolpius and his companions are low libertines and unprincipled adventurers. The language of the principal narrator is that of a man of education, while that of Trimalchio and the subordinate characters teems with Grecisms, vulgarisms, and provincialisms. Thus we find such forms as *balneus*, *fatus*, *uinus*, *Frunisci*, *maledicere* and *persuadere* govern the accusative. Verbs neuter or active become deponent; e.g. *qui rideatur alios*, and *cum delectaretur dominam*. Among the more striking proverbial phrases we have *assem habeas, assem ualeas*; *habet habebetis*; *manus manum lauat*; and *manum de tabula*. In the *Cena Trimalchionis* we find the Latin original of the question asked in the familiar game:—'buck, buck, how many horns do I hold up?', *bucca, bucca, quot sunt hic?* (64); and a weird story of a were-wolf (62), which also has its parallels in Pliny (viii 80) and Apuleius (*Met.* ii 20).

997. Gaius Plinius Secundus (c. 23—79 A.D.), the son of a Roman *eques* by the daughter of the senator, Gaius Caecilius, was born at Nouum Comum. Before 35 A.D. he was taken to Rome, and there educated under the poet and soldier, P. Pomponius Secundus, who inspired him with a life-long love of learning (*N. H.* xxxvii 81). He studied botany in the gardens of Antonius Castor (xxv 9). Under the influence of Seneca he became a keen student of philosophy and rhetoric, and began to practise at the bar (44 A.D.). He served under Corbulo in Germany (47), and revisited that country in 50 and (with Titus) in 57. Under Nero he completed his *History of the German wars*, probably a principal authority for the *Germania* of Tacitus, and expressly quoted in the *Annals* (i 69). His *History of his Times* is cited by Tacitus in four passages, and was one of the authorities followed by Suetonius and Plutarch. Under Vespasian he was *procurator* of Gallia Narbonensis (70) and Hispania Tarraconensis (73). He also visited Africa (vii 36). He dedicated his *Naturalis Historia* to Titus (77), and soon afterwards received from Vespasian the command of the fleet at Misenum. He was there stationed when he met his death during the great eruption of Vesuvius on the 24th of August, 79 A.D.

The elder  
Pliny.

In the Letters of his nephew, the younger Pliny, we have a sketch of his manner of life and a chronological list of his writings (iii 5), and also an account of his death (vi 16 and 20).

His only extant work is the *Naturalis Historia*, consisting of xxxvii Books. Book i begins with a characteristic preface written in an involved and stilted style, followed by tables of contents and lists of authorities. The contents of the remaining Books are as follows :—

ii, mathematical and physical description of the world; iii—vi, geography and ethnography; vii, anthropology and human physiology; viii—xi, zoology; xii—xxvii, botany, including agriculture, horticulture, and *materia medica*; xxviii—xxxii, medical zoology; xxxiii—xxxvii, mineralogy, especially in its application to life and art, including chasing in silver (xxxiii 154–7), statuary in bronze (xxxiv), painting (xxxv 15–149), modelling (151–8), sculpture in marble (xxxvi), and precious stones (xxxvii).

The author claims to have collected 20,000 facts derived from some 2000 works by 100 select authors (*praef.* 17). His extracts from these sources were bequeathed to his nephew in 160 volumes. He makes a point of acknowledging his obligations (*praef.* 21). His principal authority is Varro, supplemented, in the geographical books, from the commentaries of Agrippa completed by Augustus. His zoology comes mainly from Aristotle and Iuba. For the history of art the original Greek authorities are Duris of Samos (*fl.* 300 B.C.), Xenocrates of Sicyon (*fl.* 280), and Antigonus of Carystos (*fl.* 255), while, in the indices to xxxiii–vi, an important place is assigned to Pasicles of Naples (*fl.* 88 B.C.). But Pliny's knowledge of the above Greek authorities was probably mainly due to Varro. He shows no special aptitude as a critic of works of art. In several passages, however, he gives proof of independent observation. Thus, he prefers the marble *Laocoön* in the palace of Titus to all the pictures and bronzes in the world (xxxvi 37).

Pliny was in the main an adherent of the Stoics, who were devoted to the study of Nature, while their moral teaching was peculiarly acceptable to one who was unselfishly eager to instruct his contemporaries. In history, he does not suppress facts unfavourable to Rome (xxxiv 139); he is free from Livy's undue partiality for the aristocracy; his heroes are old Romans of the type of Cincinnatus and Cato; he laments the decline of agriculture and indicates its cause, 'latitundia perdidere Italiam' (xvii 38); and he is intensely patriotic,—'in toto orbe...pulcherrima omnium est, in rebusque merito principatum naturae obtinet Italia' (xxxvii 201; cp. iii 39f). He regards the imperial power as indispensable for the government of the Empire, and he hails the 'salutaris exortus Vespasiani' (xxxiii 51). In literature he assigns the highest place to Homer and Cicero, and the next to Virgil. He studied the natural sciences in a way that was new in Rome, and the little esteem in which those studies were held does not prevent his endeavouring to be of service to his countrymen (xxii 18). As a scientific writer he fails because he is a compiler destitute of the critical faculty, and of the leisure required for independent investigation. His great work is

nevertheless a comprehensive encyclopaedia of science and of art, so far as they are connected with Nature, or draw their materials from it. A special interest attaches to his account of the manufacture of papyrus (xiii 68—83) and of the different kinds of purple dye (ix 130), while his elaborate description of the notes of the nightingale exemplifies his not infrequent felicity of phrase (xxix 81 f).

His style (which is very uneven) betrays the influence of the elder Cato and of Seneca. It aims less at perspicuity than at epigrammatic point. It abounds in interrogations and exclamations, in tropes and metaphors, and in other mannerisms of the Silver Age. There is also an excessive use of the ablative absolute, which is often appended in a kind of vague apposition to the immediately preceding statement:—e.g. 'dixit (Apelles)...uno se praestare quod manum de tabula sciret tollere, *memorabili praecepto* nocere saepe nimiam diligentiam' (xxxv 80). (Cp. §§ 1068-9 *infra*.)

998. Fabius Quintilianus (c. 35—95 A.D.), born at Calagurris on the Ebro, was educated under the grammarian Remmius Palaemon in Rome, where his own father was a teacher of rhetoric. On completing his studies he returned to Spain, to leave it once more for Rome in 68, when he opened a school of rhetoric, which received a public endowment from Vespasian. Among his pupils was the younger Pliny. As a prominent and influential professor of rhetoric in Rome, Quintilian is addressed by Martial in the following terms:—

'Quintiliane, uagae moderator summe iuuentae,  
gloria Romanae, Quintiliane, togae' (ii 90, 1).

On his retirement, twenty years later, he devoted himself to the composition of his great work, the *Institutio Oratoria*. He attained the honorary dignity of consul after he had taken part in the education of the two grandsons of the sister of Domitian, whose poems he mentions in flattering terms (x 1, 91). He married late in life, and lost his wife and both his sons in the flower of their age.

Quintilian's lost work *De causis corruptae eloquentiae* was completed shortly before he began the composition of the *Institutio Oratoria*. It was concerned with the literary rather than the political and ethical aspects of the question, and was mainly directed against the practice of declamation and the unhealthy influence of the style of Seneca. His *Institutio Oratoria* is a complete survey of the education of the future orator. The contents of the several Books are briefly sketched in the preface to the first (§ 21 f):—

(i), the elements of grammar and philology; (ii), the elements of rhetoric; (iii—vii), *inuentio* and *dispositio*; (viii—xi), *elocutio*, with *memoria* and *pronuntiatio*; (xii), the moral character of the orator and the principles to be followed in the choice of his style, and in the discharge of his professional duties.

In the course of the work he attacks the *affecteda subtilitas* of the ordinary hand-books of rhetoric, while he founds his own teaching on his personal experience and on the practice of the principal orators. He insists on the importance of the ethical basis of oratory, quoting with approval Cato's definition of an orator as 'uir bonus dicendi peritus'

(xii 1, 1). He opposes the prevailing artificial taste, and falls back on the promptings of nature, in the spirit of the precept 'pectus disertos facit' (x 7, 15). He has the highest admiration for Cicero, whom he almost invariably follows in his exposition of the principles of rhetoric; he confesses to an 'amor immodicus' for that foremost orator (vi 3, 31), and concludes a glowing encomium of his style with the words:—'ille se profecisse sciat, cui Cicero ualde placebit' (x 1, 112). He refers to more than 450 passages of Cicero, and about 140 of Virgil, finding his models in the classical writers of the golden age, while he warns his pupils against imitating either the archaic or the modern (ii 5, 21f). Apart from Cicero, his Roman authorities are the *auctor ad Herennium*, Rutilius Lupus, Remmius Palaemon, and Celsus, whom he criticises as well as copies, while his Greek authorities are, on education, Chrysippus, and, on rhetoric, Caecilius, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, whose treatise *On Imitation* is the principal source of the brief criticisms on Greek authors in his celebrated survey of all those portions of Greek and Latin literature which he holds to be of special service in forming the style of the future orator (x 1).

999. The name of Quintilian has been assigned to two collections of Declamations, respectively comprising 19 longer and 145 shorter pieces. The former are ascribed to his pen by Seruius and Ausonius, and by Jerome, who speaks of 'Quintiliani concinnae declamationes', but they are of much later date, while the latter have nothing more than the manuscript tradition in their favour.

1000. Quintilian's contemporary, Iulius Frontinus (c. 41—c. 103), who was *praetor urbanus* in 70 A.D. (Tac. *Hist.* iv 39), must have been born in or before 41. Under Vespasian he was consul, and distinguished himself c. 76—78 as the successor of Petilius Cerealis in Britain, where he conquered the Silures (Tac. *Agr.* 17). Under Domitian he probably took part in the war against the Chatti (83); he was *curator aquarum* in 97, and again consul in 98 and 100. He was a friend of Martial (x 48 and 58) and of the younger Pliny, who succeeded him as *augur* c. 103—104 (iv 8). On his death-bed he expressed, in the following terms, his desire that no monument should be erected in his memory:—'Impensa monumenti superuacua est; memoria nostri durabit, si uita meruimus' (ix 19, 6).

Under Domitian (81—96) Frontinus composed two works:—(1) on land-surveying and on the land-laws, which only survives in certain excerpts preserved in the *commentum de agrorum qualitate* of Agennius Urbicus (cent. iv—v); (2) a manual of strategy, *Strategemata*, in three Books, written after 84 A.D., the year in which Domitian took the title of Germanicus (ii 11, 7), and including illustrations of the art of war derived mainly from Sallust, Caesar, and Livy. A fourth Book on military discipline, which is regarded as spurious, mentions the submission of the Lingones in 70 A.D. (3, 14). This passage may have been interpolated from a genuine work of Frontinus.

Under Nerva, in 97, Frontinus began his work on the water-supply of Rome, *de aquis urbis Romae*, which he completed under Trajan in 98. This work was the immediate result of the author's appointment as *curator aquarum* in 97. It gives us the names and dates, the course and the construction of the Roman aqueducts, and notices the legal questions connected with the use of the water supplied by them. It is written in a simple and clear style, and includes quotations from original documents (100, 104, 106, 108). Both of the extant works of Frontinus exhibit many traces of the popular language, with which the author himself contrasts that of the *cultiores* (Aq. § 3). In both he aims at being useful to others:—'hoc opus, sicut cetera, usus



potius aliorum, quam meae commendationis causa adgressus sum' (*Strat. Praef.*). From Frontinus we turn to his far more famous contemporary, Tacitus.

1001. The birthplace of Cornelius Tacitus (c. 55—c. 117) and the dates of his birth and death are unknown. Publius is his praenomen in the first Medicean MS, while Gaius is the form found in later MSS and in Sidonius Apollinaris (*Tacitus. Epp.* iv 14, 1; 22, 2). He may have been the son, or the nephew, of an *equus* mentioned by the elder Pliny (vii 76); he was certainly trained in rhetoric by Marcus Aper and Iulius Secundus, *celeberrima tum ingenia fori nostri* (*Dial.* 2). In 78 he married the daughter of Agricola, who had been one of the consuls of the preceding year, and was on the point of succeeding Frontinus as *propraetor* of Britain. Under the three Flavian emperors, Tacitus passed through the earlier stages of his public career (*Hist.* i 1); he was probably *tribunus militum laticlauius* under Vespasian, *quaestor* under Titus (c. 80—81), and *tribune* or *aedile* (c. 84), and *praetor* (88), under Domitian (*Ann.* xi 11). He was absent from Rome in 90—93, when he was possibly *legatus pro praetore* in the *provincia Belgica*. Late in 97, under Nerva, he was consul, and then delivered the funeral oration on Verginius Rufus (*Plin. Ep.* ii 1, 6). Early in 100, he was associated with Pliny in the prosecution of Marius Priscus, the *proconsul* of Africa (*ib.* ii 11, 2, 17). He was himself *proconsul* of Asia about 113—116. He completed his *Annals* about 116, and probably died not long after.

1002. The dramatic date of the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* (c. 17) is the sixth year of Vespasian (July 74—July 75), when 117 years had elapsed since the death of Cicero in 43 B.C. (The author says 120, and, in the context, the rule of Augustus is accordingly made to extend over 59 years, instead of 56.) The author was then *admodum iuuenis*. Such is his description of himself, when he looks back on the date of the *Dialogue* from the date of its composition. The date of the latter is uncertain. Three dates have been suggested:—either the last year of Titus, 81 (Gudeman), or after the tenth year of Domitian, 91 (Norden), or the first year of Trajan, 98 (Schanz). Tacitus tells us that, during the reign of Domitian, he remained 'silent' (*Agr.* 14), but this is not inconsistent with his having composed the *Dialogue* in that reign and published it later. The earliest of the above three dates is favoured by the fact that the style is more Ciceronian than that of any of the works of Tacitus, and by the consideration that this resemblance is natural in the case of a comparatively youthful writer fresh from the study of Cicero. On the other hand, at that early date, two of those attacked in the treatise, Eprius Marcellus and Vibius Crispus, were still living; so also was Maternus, one of the interlocutors in the dialogue; a sophist named Maternus was executed in 91; and Crispus died in 93. This is in favour of the latest of the three dates (98).

The objection to this date is that it makes the *Dialogue* contemporary with the *Agricola* and *Germania*, thus implying that the author wrote simultaneously in two different styles, one of them modelled on Cicero and the other created by himself. Nevertheless, it is fairly urged that a Ciceronian style is the most natural medium for a dialogue, especially for one written in direct imitation of the *De Oratore*.

Its main subject is a discussion of the differences between the oratory of Cicero's time

and that of contemporary speakers, with the causes of that difference. Aper represents the new rhetoric of the school of Seneca; Messala praises that of a purer age, and attacks the degenerate education of his own day; while Maternus, admitting the degeneracy, finds the reason for it in the happier conditions of modern life, adding that the orators of the older generation deserved to be applauded but not to be envied.

The Dialogue owes its preservation to its being included in the same MS as the *Agricola* and *Germania*. Its genuineness was doubted, first by Beatus Rhenanus (1519), next by Lipsius, who, in his edition of 1574, was inclined to attribute it to Quintilian, but, in later editions, to an anonymous author. Subsequent opinion pointed to Quintilian, or possibly the younger Pliny, or even Suetonius. In 1828 the claims of Tacitus were revived by A. G. Lange, who considered that, in Pliny's letter to Tacitus (ix 10), written c. 108-9, the words *nemora et lucos* were a quotation from the Dialogue (c. 9). The Ciceronian diction may well be due to the influence of Quintilian, and the style of the speeches delivered by Tacitus as an advocate probably approximated more closely to that of Cicero than to that of his own historical works. But the Dialogue, apart from its Ciceronianism, exhibits not a few coincidences of language and syntax with those characteristic of Tacitus. Thus the words *histrionalis* and *clientulus* are found elsewhere in the *Annals* alone.

1003. The *Agricola* was written early in the reign of Trajan, probably in 98 A.D. (*Agr.* 3). It is to be regarded neither as a funeral oration, nor as a compromise between history and biography, nor as an *apologia* for *Agricola* in a biographical form, but simply as a historical eulogy or laudatory biography. Here the influence of Cicero is less marked than that of Sallust, whose style it resembles in its rhetorical speeches, and in its sententious reflexions.

1004. The *Germania* was published in the same year (*Germ.* 37). It is a brief treatise on the geography and ethnology of Germany. It is neither a political pamphlet nor a covert satire on the Romans in the form of an eulogy of the virtues of the Germans. The faults of those northern barbarians are noticed no less than their virtues. Here and there, however, we have a satirical touch to the disadvantage of the Romans:—'*nemo illic uitia ridet, nec corrumpere et corrumpi saeculum uocatur*' (c. 19).

1005. The *Historiae* were written in the reign of Trajan (*Hist.* i 1), and were probably published by instalments. In the earlier Letters of Pliny (in or before 100), Tacitus is lauded as the eloquent and dignified orator (ii 11, 7); in the later letters (c. 106-8) he is the historian whose writings are destined to be immortal (vi 16, 1; vii 31, 1). In its complete form, the work extended from the death of Nero to the death of Domitian (69-96 A.D.), in some 12 or 14 Books, of which only Books i-iv and part of v are extant (69-70). The author's original intention had been to bring out the contrast between Domitian and his immediate successors, Nerva and Trajan, by relating 'past servitude and present happiness'; but 'present happiness' was now withdrawn from his programme and vaguely reserved for his old age.

1006. The *Annales*, extending from the death of Augustus to the death of Nero (14-68 A.D.), were published between 115 and 117 A.D. They originally consisted of some 16 to 18 Books, but only a part has been preserved. Of the two Medicean MSS one contains Books i-iv (14-28 A.D.), with a fragment of Book v and the whole of Book vi (31-37 A.D.); the other, part of Book xi (from 47 A.D.) and Books xii-xvi, the last being incomplete, reaching only to 66 A.D., and leaving a gap of three years before the beginning of the *Historiae*. We have thus lost the reign of Caligula, the first six years of Claudius, and the last three of Nero.

1007. In the *Historiae* the only authorities named are Vipstanus Messalla (iii 25, 28) and the elder Pliny (iii 28). In the first six Books of the *Annals*, Pliny (i 69), as well as the *Commentarii* of Agrippina the younger (iv 53), the speeches of Tiberius (i 81), and the *Acta Diurna* (iii 3); and, in the second half, Cluvius Rufus (xiii 20, xiv 2), Fabius Rusticus (xiv 2, xv 61), Pliny (xiii 20, xv 53), Domitius Corbulo (xv 16), and the *Commentarii Senatus* (xv 74). Far oftener the historian refers to his authorities in merely general terms; he also relies on personal

information. But his relations to the authorities named cannot be tested, as not one of those authorities has survived. The speech, however, of Claudius, conferring the *ius honorum* on the inhabitants of Gaul, is still extant<sup>1</sup>, and we are thus able to appreciate the skill with which it is remodelled in the historian's report (*Ann.* xi 24). The close correspondence between Tacitus and Plutarch in their accounts of Galba and Otho implies either that Plutarch borrowed from Tacitus, or that (more probably) both derived their information from a common source, either the *Acta Publica*, or the elder Pliny, or Cluvius Rufus.

1008. Tacitus is essentially a conservative; he constantly uses *antiquus* and *priscus* as terms of praise (*Hist.* ii 5, 64; *Ann.* vi 32). In his general attitude he is aristocratic; he sets great store by noble blood (*Ann.* iv 3, vi 27), while he has a prejudice against slaves and barbarians and persons of humble origin. He speaks with pride of the Republic (iii 60), a form of constitution which he theoretically prefers (vi 42); he considers a mixed government to be ideally the best, but unlikely to last (iv 33); he admits that a Free State cannot be restored (*Hist.* ii 37—38) and that the Empire has proved inevitable (*Hist.* i 16). The problem is to reconcile the Empire with liberty (*Agr.* 3), and the citizen's duty lies in steering 'inter abruptam contumaciam et deforme obsequium' (*Ann.* iv 20). Hence he disapproves of extreme patriots such as Pactus Thrasea (xiv 12, 49) and Helvidius Priscus (*Hist.* iv 6), while he prefers moderate liberals like Agricola (*Agr.* 8, 42), M. Lepidus (*Ann.* iv 20, vi 27) and L. Piso (vi 10).

In the prefaces to his two great historical works, he aims at preserving a complete impartiality. In the *Annals* he proposes at the outset to write *sine ira et studio*; in the *Histories*, he assures us, *neque amore quisquam ei sine odio dicendus est*; but these promises are only imperfectly kept. The historian may be inspired with an incorruptible honesty of purpose, but his personal preferences are too strong to be entirely suppressed. In the *Annals*, his masterpiece is his much-debated character of Tiberius, the mainspring of which, he assumes, was dissimulation. In general, we hear too much of the gossip and scandal and the corrupt life of the court and the capital, and too little of the undoubtedly efficient government of the provinces.

Tacitus has been described by Mommsen as the 'most un military of all authors'<sup>2</sup>. The essential facts of Paulinus' victory in Britain, duly noted in the *Agricola* (31), are entirely omitted in the main narrative of the *Annals* (xiv 31—39). He never wearies the reader by lingering over tactical or strategic details, in which he personally feels an imperfect interest<sup>3</sup>, but his descriptions of battles are full of glow and colour, as in the matchless story of the second battle of Bedriacum and the storm and sack of Cremona (*Hist.* iii 15—35). We see the flash of the standards near the fourth milestone from Cremona (18), and the soldiers of the third legion saluting

<sup>1</sup> Dessau, *Inscr. Selectae*, i 52. Cp. § 1124 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, c. 5, E. T., i 181 n., 1886.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. B. W. Henderson, *Civil War and Rebellion in the Roman Empire*, A.D. 69—70 (1908).

the rising sun (24). He is an orator no less than a historian. He resorts to every kind of rhetorical artifice to heighten the effect of his narrative, and for this purpose he has created a style that is absolutely unique in Latin literature, a style in which brevity in itself, though doubtless present, is really a less important characteristic than a deliberate preference for combining the largest possible number of thoughts within the compass of a single sentence. This result is partly attained by a superabundance of particles, which are more frequent with him than with Caesar or Livy. The leading characteristics of his style are its variety, its force and brevity, and its poetic complexion. His variety of *construction* may be exemplified by the three following clauses:—‘quod alii modestiam, multi quia diffideret, quidam ut degeneris animi interpretabantur’ (*Ann.* iv 38); his variety of *vocabulary*, by his fifty phrases for death. In his choice of language he excludes all that is obsolete or foreign; he also avoids the ordinary or commonplace, e.g. ‘mattocks and spades’ are expressed by ‘per quae egeritur humus aut exciditur caespes’ (*Ann.* i 65). He has a love of poetic words or phrases, with repeated reminiscences of Virgil. Thus the description of the burning of the Capitol in the third Book of the *Historiae* is interwoven with many memories of the Fall of Troy in the Second *Aeneid*. The Ciceronian type of period is foreign to the age of Tacitus; the laws of balance and symmetry are deliberately ignored by the impassioned historian, and the fitful outbursts of his appalling narrative find a highly artistic and effective medium in sentences that are spasmodic, broken, and abrupt.

Like Seneca, he is the coiner of many epigrammatic phrases that have since become proverbial:—‘Maior e longinquo reuerentia’ (*Ann.* i 47). ‘Corruptissima republica plurimae leges’ (iii 27). ‘Miseram pacem uel bello bene mutari’ (*ib.* 44). ‘Praefulgabant..., eo ipso quod...non uisebantur’ (*ib.* 76). ‘Acribus initiis, incurioso fine’ (vi 17). ‘Omnium consensu capax imperii, nisi imperasset’ (*Hist.* i 49). ‘Etiam sapientibus cupido gloriae nouissima exuitur’ (iv 6). ‘Omne ignotum pro magnifico’ (*Aggr.* 30). ‘Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant’ (30). ‘Felix opportunitate mortis’ (45).

1009. Tacitus' friend, Pliny the younger (c. 61—c. 113 A.D.), a native of Nouum Comum, was the second son of Lucius Caecilius Cilo by Plinia, the sister of the elder Pliny. When the latter was summoned to Rome by Vespasian in 72 A.D., he was probably accompanied by his nephew, who in his boyhood went through the usual course of education in Roman literature, and in Greek. He afterwards studied rhetoric under Quintilian, and also under the distinctly ‘Asiatic’ orator, Nicetes Sacerdos, while he modelled his own oratorical style on Demosthenes, Cicero, and Calvus. He was an admirer of the famous Stoic, Musonius. In August, 79, he was in attendance on his uncle at Misenum, when the latter lost his life during the celebrated eruption of Vesuvius. As the adopted son of the elder Pliny, he changed his name from Publius Caecilius Secundus to Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus. In the following year he became a *decurio stlitibus indicandis*. Under Domitian, he was a military tribune in Syria (c. 81–2). On his return, he practised in the Court of the *Centumuires*, and was successively quaestor, tribune, and praetor (93), and praetfect of the military chest (94 or 95). Under Nerva he became praetfect of the public treasury; in 100 A.D., under Trajan, he was associated with Tacitus in the prosecution of Marius Priscus for maladministration in Africa, and was consul for part of the year. In 103–4 he succeeded



Frontinus as augur; in 105 he was curator of the river Tiber; in 104 and 106 his professional duties at the bar made him familiar with the affairs of Bithynia, and, about 111, he was appointed governor of that province. He reached Bithynia in September, held office for fifteen months or more, and probably died in 113. During his lifetime he founded and endowed a library at his native place, and, besides promoting local education, established an institution for the maintenance and instruction of the sons and daughters of freeborn parents. By his will he left a large sum for the building and maintenance of Public Baths, and the interest of a still larger sum for the benefit of 100 freedmen, and ultimately for an annual banquet.

1010. As an orator, Pliny prefers redundancy of style to a dry and arid brevity (*Ep.* i 20). His *Panegyric on Trajan* (100 A.D.), which was afterwards recited, and published in an expanded form, is unduly florid. But it supplies us with a full account of the emperor's antecedents and of his early policy. It purports to be the speaker's *Gratiarum Actio* for the distinction of his nomination as consul. It became the model for panegyric orations in honour of emperors, and in fact owes its survival to its having been preserved in company with speeches founded on its pattern. It is full of fanciful personifications and antithetical conceits. Thus, in describing the triumph of Trajan, in which the emperor condescended to walk on foot instead of riding in a chariot, the orator closes with the phrase:—‘te ad sidera tollit humus ista communis et confusa principis uestigia’ (24). *Panegyricus.*

1011. Of Pliny's *Letters* we possess nine Books, followed by his *Correspondence with Trajan*. The successive Books are in strictly chronological order, but the order of the letters in each Book is not chronological. *Epistulae.*

It was held by Mommsen that we possess no Letters earlier than the death of Domitian (Sept. 96), and that the several Books were published in the following order:—i (97); ii (100); iii (101-2); iv (105); v and vi (106); vii (107); viii (108); and ix (not later than 109); while the Correspondence with Trajan belongs to 111-2. One of the Letters (ii 20) has since been placed late in Domitian's reign, and it has been suggested by Prof. Merrill that the ix Books were published in three groups:—i—ii (97 or 98); iii—vi (106); vii—ix (108 or 109).

They present us with a picture of the varied interests and occupations of a cultivated Roman gentleman. They include elaborate descriptions of Pliny's Laurentian and Tuscan villas (ii 17 and v 6), with accounts of the way in which he spent his day in each (ix 36, 40). He consults Suetonius on the interpretation of dreams (i 18); he laments the death of Silius Italicus (iii 7), of Martial (iii 21), and of Verginius Rufus (ii 1); and he supplies Tacitus with materials for his history by describing the last days of the elder Pliny (vi 16, 20), and also by relating a compliment paid to himself by Nerua in connexion with his prosecution of the proconsul of the *prouincia Baetica* (vii 33). He discourses on the intermittent spring in the neighbourhood of Comum (iv 30), on the mountain of the Clitumnus (viii 8), and on the floating islands of the Vadimonian lake (viii 20), closing his description of these last by confessing his delight in the marvels of nature:—‘te quoque, ut me, nihil aeque ac naturae opera delectant’.

**1012.** His *Correspondence with Trajan* gives us information on points of detail in the government of Bithynia and on the relations between the government and the central authority. Pliny's pertinacity in raising questions of detail is only equalled by the wisdom and patience displayed by Trajan in his replies. The most celebrated letter in this correspondence is that in which Pliny consults Trajan on the principles on which Christians were to be treated when brought before his tribunal (*Ep.* 96).

In his other *Letters*, as well as in his *Panegyric*, Pliny's ambition is to display his powers of literary expression. Almost every Letter deals with a single topic, and ends with a terse and epigrammatic sentence. Every living person named in them is praised, with the exception of Regulus, whom Pliny denounces as 'omnium bipedum nequissimus' (i 5, 14). As a rule, he is indulgent in criticising others, both in life and in literature. He is obviously a man of gentlemanly tone, devoted to his friends, kindly and considerate to his inferiors; great in nothing, and small in many things, but always inspired with high aims. When he is urged to write a history, though he has misgivings as to his powers, he is attracted by the hope of acquiring immortal fame by making the memory of others immortal (*Ep.* v 8). His diction has an affinity with that of his instructor, Quintilian; and, like Quintilian, he is an imitator of Cicero. He also gives proof of the influence of the rhetorical schools of his day. He was a diligent student of Livy (vi 20, 5), and parallels have been traced between his writings and the *Agricola* and *Germania* of Tacitus. In the Revival of Learning they were less studied than the *Letters* of Cicero. In modern times they have been mainly appreciated for the light which they throw on social life in the age of Trajan.

**1013.** C. Suetonius Tranquillus (c. 75—160 A.D.), the son of a tribune of the XIIIth legion who took part in the battle of Bedriacum (69 A.D.), was one of the correspondents of the younger Pliny, who obtained for him a military tribuneship, and the *ius trium liberorum*, helped him to purchase a small estate, and urged him to publish some of his writings (v 10). Under Hadrian he was *magister epistularum*, but was dismissed in 121 and devoted the rest of his life to literary pursuits.

**1014.** His work *De uita Caesarum*, published in 119—121 A.D., comprises the lives of the first twelve Caesars, beginning with Julius and ending with Domitian. He uses original authorities, such as the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, the *Acta Populi* and *Acta Senatus*, with autograph documents of the emperors (*Aug.* 87; *Nero* 52). He rarely quotes Tacitus and never names that historian or the elder Pliny or Cluvius Rufus. He seldom supplies us with any dates, and the larger part of his work consists of personal anecdotes of the private lives of the Caesars, without regard to the general course of the history of the Empire. He has given us a most vivid description of the death of Julius Caesar and of Nero. He is, however, neither a historian nor a biographer, but an industrious collector and a methodical sorter of

biographical items, who remains in the background and allows the facts to speak for themselves. He is only too fond of recording gossip and scandal, and he recounts creditable and discreditable facts with an apparent partiality for the latter. Each of the 'Lives' falls, in general, into four sections,—name, exploits, manner of life, and death. All these are neatly summed up in the *Caesares* of Ausonius :—

‘ Suetonius olim  
nomina, res gestas, uitamque obitumque peregit ’.

His style is marked by simplicity, lucidity, and terseness. It is said of him by Vopiscus :—‘ Suetonio...familiare fuit amare breuitatem ’.

1015. His treatise *De uiris illustribus* dealt with poets, orators, historians, philosophers, ‘ grammarians ’ (*i.e.* scholars), and rhetoricians. It was probably published in 106—113 A.D. It is now represented by the greater part of the section *de grammaticis et rhetoribus*, and by the lives of Terence, Horace, and Lucan, and that of the elder Pliny. The author's general attitude is that of Quintilian (x 1). His earliest orator is Cicero; his earliest historian, Sallust; and he severely criticises Lucan, and Seneca (*Nero*, 52). Hence it may be inferred that he was not attracted either by the archaic or the modern style. Excerpts from the lost portions of the above work have been preserved by Jerome, who borrows its title in a work of his own.

*De uiris  
illustribus.*

1016. Suetonius was also the author of various works which may be grouped under the head of Antiquities, Natural History, and Grammar. The first of these comprised, under the general title of *Roma*, treatises on manners and customs, on the Roman year, on Roman games and dress. There were also separate works on Greek games, and on public offices. The second (under the title of *Prata*) treated of man and nature, and of the divisions of time. The third, of Greek terms of vituperation, of grammatical questions, and of symbols used for purposes of textual criticism. Through Isidore of Seville, these lost works had a considerable influence on the literature of the Middle Ages. The incomplete treatise of Censorinus, *De die natali* (238 A.D.), containing much valuable information on points of chronology, is mainly compiled from Varro, and from a lost work of Suetonius.

*Antiquities.*

*Natural  
History.  
Grammar.*

Censorinus.

1017. P. Annius Florus wrote, in the reign of Hadrian, his *Bellorum Romanorum libri duo*, an epitome of Roman history mainly founded on Livy. His work is practically a panegyric on the Roman Empire. Its hero is the *populus Romanus*, whose ‘ infancy ’ (says Florus) had been the age of the kings, while its ‘ adolescence ’ ended with the conquest of Italy, and its ‘ youth ’ with Augustus, who marks the beginning of its ‘ old age ’. The author is particularly fond of words such as *quippe* and the apologetic *quasi*, and he abounds in exaggerations and in exclamations. His work is, in fact, a dithyramb in prose. He often borrows from Lucan, and his diction is partly poetical, and partly rhetorical. In all probability he is identical with the rhetorician Florus, who discussed the question whether Virgil was to be regarded as a poet or as an orator; and with the poet Florus, the author of the lines on Hadrian beginning ‘ ego nolo Caesar esse, ambulare per Britannos ’, which had the honour of a retort from Hadrian himself (Spartianus, *Hadrian*, 16, 3).

Florus.

1018. To the age of Hadrian we may ascribe a short history of the Roman republic bearing the name of Granius Licinianus. The extant portion refers to 163—78 B.C. The author depends mainly on Livy, while he regards Sallust as an orator rather than as a historian. His date is determined by his reference to the completion of the *Olympiæum*, an event which took place under

Granius  
Licinianus.

Hadrian. He has a predilection for miracles and for fictitious stories. He may be identified with the antiquarian of the same name quoted by Macrobius and Seruius.

1019. The imperial biographies of Suetonius were continued by Marius Maximus (c. 165—230), who wrote the lives of the emperors beginning with Nerva

*Scriptores  
historiae  
augustae.*

and ending with Elagabalus. Meagre extracts from these lives are preserved in the first half of the *Scriptores historiae augustae*. This comprehensive title is given to the six authors of the lives of the emperors

beginning with Hadrian and ending with Numerianus (117—284), the MSS of which are all derived from a lost original in which the years 244 to 260 are missing. Four of the six wrote as early as the age of Diocletian (284—305), viz. *Aelius Spartianus* (the biographer of Hadrian, Aelius, Didius Iulianus, Septimius Seuerus, Pescennius Niger, Caracalla and Geta); *Iulius Capitolinus* (the biographer of Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Verus, Pertinax, Clodius Albinus, Macrinus, the two Maximini, the three Gordiani, Maximus and Balbinus); *Vulcacius Gallicanus* wrote the life of Avidius Cassius; *Trebellius Pollio*, those of the Valeriani, the Gallieni, the 'thirty tyrants', and Claudius. The attitude of these biographers is invariably that of servile courtiers; they dwell mainly on the merest personal details; they have no literary skill; but they may be regarded as honest and truthful witnesses to the facts recorded by them. The other two 'Scriptores' are *Aelius Lampridius* (the biographer of Commodus, Elagabalus and Alex. Seuerus), and *Vopiscus* (who began with Aurelian and ended with the sons of Carus). Some of the biographies are dedicated to Diocletian and others to Constantine. The difficult questions raised by them have been much discussed in recent years<sup>1</sup>.

1020. The reigns of Hadrian and the Antonines were included in the

*Gaius.*

lifetime of the admirable jurist, Gaius (c. 110—c. 180), who was probably born in the East, and was a private lecturer on

law in Rome, where he published the substance of his lectures in 161 A.D. This work, which is known as the *Institutiones*, forms an introduction to Roman jurisprudence. It has been solely preserved in a fifth-century palimpsest discovered in 1816 by Niebuhr at Verona. Graceful and natural in its language, and easy in its transitions, it is marked by an absence of archaisms and by a close adherence to the best classical models. Jurists in general are credited by Quintilian with a 'summus circa uerborum proprietatem labor' (v 14, 34); and Mommsen has described the style of Gaius in particular as 'naturali sua simplicitate...prisco candore nitentem'<sup>2</sup>.

1021. M. Cornelius Fronto of Cirta in Northern Africa (c. 100—175) was con-

*Fronto.*

spicuous as an orator under Hadrian, while, under Antoninus Pius, he was consul in 143, and preceptor of his sons, M. Aurelius and L. Verus.

The greater part of Fronto's correspondence with M. Aurelius, as heir apparent and as emperor, is still extant, having been first published by Mai (in 1815—23) from a palimpsest of the sixth century. Fronto was an enthusiastic admirer of the early Latin literature. His favourite poets were Ennius, Accius, Plautus, and Lucretius, while, in prose, he preferred Cato, Gracchus, and Sallust. He never actually mentions Terence or Virgil, but he has some reminiscences of Virgil, Horace and Tacitus. He has an antipathy to the teaching and the style of Seneca. He has read all the works of Cicero, and prefers his *Letters* to his *Speeches*. He occasionally praises him, but he repeatedly uses the epithet *Tullianus* in a somewhat contemptuous sense. He stands self-condemned, when he finds fault with Cicero for never using 'insperata atque inopinata uerba' in his public orations, Fronto's own preference being for an archaic and recondite vocabulary. In the eyes of

<sup>1</sup> Curt Wachsmuth, *Einleitung*, 690, n. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Ed. Krüger-Studemund, p. xvii.



Fronto, rhetoric is the crown of human life, and the counsellor and consoler of the human race. The ruler finds his most potent weapon in the word; even the general is powerless without it! When M. Aurelius sensibly resigned the study of rhetoric for that of philosophy, Fronto raised a voice of warning and drew a gloomy picture of the consequences of this resolve. What a noble occupation it is (he exclaims) to collect synonyms, to search out exquisite expressions, and to translate Latin into Greek! A Gallic panegyrist (Eumenius) describes him as 'eloquentiae non secundum, sed alterum decus'. His main merit is that he was the tutor of M. Aurelius, who caused a statue to be set up in his honour. As soon as the recovery of his *Letters* was announced, Niebuhr eagerly resolved on editing them, and he even kept his promise. But there is a tone of disenchantment in his final verdict:—'Fronto was in fact a dolt; he would have done better, if he had adopted a mechanical trade instead of the profession of an orator and an author'<sup>1</sup>.

1022. Aulus Gellius, born c. 130 A.D., possibly in Northern Africa, studied 'grammar' in Rome under Sulpicius Apollinaris of Carthage. He was a friend of the rhetoricians Fronto and Faurinus. About the age of 30, after Gellius. holding office as a *iudex*, he spent a year in Athens, where he interested himself in Platonism, made the acquaintance of the Cynic, Peregrinus Proteus, and was often invited to the country-house of Herodes Atticus. He returned to Rome, but of his later life we know nothing.

Gellius, who was a diligent collector of literary *miscellanea*, began arranging his materials in the long winter evenings near Athens, and was thus led to give his work the name of *Noctes Atticae* (praef. 4). It is full of varied lore on philosophy, rhetoric, history, literature, and philology. Its author is a typical scholar; he frequents libraries, and examines MSS of Fabius Pictor, Cato, Catullus, Sallust, Cicero, and Virgil. He discusses the different senses of *obnoxius*, the exact meaning of *ex iure manum consortum* in Ennius, Cicero's use of *paenitere*, and the terms *assiduus* and *proletarius*. He contrasts a 'scriptor *proletarius*' with a 'scriptor *classicus*', deriving both metaphors from the *classes* of Servius Tullius, those in the first class being called *classici* and those in the last *proletarii*. He takes pains to enliven his learning by throwing his information into the form of a description, an anecdote, or an imaginary dialogue, with his friends figuring as interlocutors, but the form of the dialogue is not consistently maintained. Once (in ix 4) he professes to quote, from second-hand copies of six Greek authors, whose works he has picked up at a book-stall in Brundisium, certain wonderful stories, which, strange to say, he 'afterwards found in the seventh book of Pliny'. It is from Pliny that he borrows the whole of his account of hellebore, but Pliny's name is only casually mentioned. Many of his other quotations are doubtless second-hand. For literary criticism and for incidents in the lives of Latin poets he is indebted to Varro, from whose work *De Poëtis* he quotes the epitaph of Plautus:—

'postquam est mortem aptus Plautus, Comoedia luget,  
scena est deserta, [ac] dein Risus, Ludus Iocusque,  
et Numeri innumeri simul omnes collacrimarunt'.

Niebuhr has severely said of Gellius:—'He does not possess the least knowledge of antiquity; and has no idea of law, nor of ordinary life. Respecting the colonies, for example, of which there existed hundreds in his time, he is perfectly ignorant, and gives the most ludicrous definition of them' (xvi 11)<sup>2</sup>.

1023. The Platonist and rhetorician L. Apuleius, born c. 125 at Madaura, was educated at Carthage and Athens, travelled in Greece and Asia Minor, practised as an advocate in Rome, and lectured on philosophy and rhetoric in Africa. Apuleius. He was *sacerdos prouinciae* at Carthage, where two statues were erected in his honour.

<sup>1</sup> *Kleine Schriften* (1828), 326.

<sup>2</sup> *Lectures on Roman History*, E. T., iii 241.

The most attractive, and probably the earliest, of his works is the *Metamorphōses*, a satirical novel describing the strange adventures of a youth who has been transformed into an ass. It is derived from the same Greek source as the *Asinus* of Pseudo-Lucian, and that source is supposed to have been Lucius of Patrae, whose work was known to Photius. The author has introduced into his narrative no less than 17 incidental stories. The most celebrated of these is the 'bella fabella' of *Cupid and Psyche* (iv 28—vi 24), a popular tale of Indo-European origin, written in imitation of a lost Greek model, and interspersed with a few touches of Roman colouring. In the language of Apuleius popular Latin is strangely commingled with classical Latin of different ages and different literary types, while both are combined with various foreign elements. His style in general is florid and fantastic, and is marked by an extraordinary number of epithets and diminutives. He coins new words, sometimes solely for the sake of symmetry of form, e.g. 'mulieres candido splendentes amicimine, uario laetantes gestamine, uerno florentes coronamine' (*Met.* xi 9). He is a most versatile writer; he plays many parts, and vaingloriously describes himself as a votary of all the nine Muses (*Flor.* p. 34). His other writings include (1) the *Apologia*, a defence on the charge of witchcraft (c. 155–8); (2) the *Florida*, an anthology of excerpts from his speeches and declamations; (3) *De Deo Socratis*, (4) *De Platone et eius dogmate*, and (5) *De mundo*, modelled on the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *περί κόσμου*. His style varies with his different works. The excerpts in his *Florida* are in the same affected style as his *Metamorphoses*; his *Apologia* is, in general, written in a clear and simple Ciceronian style; his *De Platone* and *De mundo* are entirely in the plain style; while his *De Deo Socratis* is in a style intermediate between the plain and the florid.

1024. Minucius Felix, an author of uncertain date who flourished either before 161 or between 213 and 250, is possibly of African origin. The influence of Cicero is clearly marked in his *Octavius*. The scene of the dialogue is laid on the sea-shore at Ostia; the current arguments against Christianity are set forth with vivacity and acumen, and are refuted with ingenuity and eloquence. The date of the work has been much disputed. It has certain points in common with the *liber Apologeticus* of Tertullian (c. 200). To account for this fact, some have held that Tertullian borrowed from Minucius Felix; others that the converse was the case; while others again (with less probability) have supposed that both borrowed from a common source which is now lost. The question asked in c. 18, 5, 'has any partnership of a throne ever begun in good faith and ended without bloodshed?', suggests a date earlier than 161, the beginning of the joint rule of Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus, who had a dutiful reverence for his wiser colleague. The work may have been meant as a reply to a possibly recent attack on Christianity made by the tutor of those two emperors, Fronto, who died c. 175, and is noticed in at least two passages (9, 6; 31, 2). The description of the scene of the dialogue reminds us of Cicero; the combatants on both sides borrow their weapons mainly from the *De Natura Deorum*, and also from the *De Divinatione*. The author is also indebted to Seneca's treatises on Providence and on Superstition, and he is familiar with Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, and Lucan. His work has more than once been called a 'golden book'; his style is fluent and elegant; and the closing syllables of his sentences have a distinctly Ciceronian rhythm. The following extract will illustrate his fondness for placing two or three nouns or verbs in close juxtaposition:—'quae singula, non modo ut crearentur fierent disponderentur, summi opificis et perfectae rationis egerunt, uerum etiam sentiri perspicui intellegi sine summa sollertia et ratione non possunt' (17, 6; cp. 23, 13, and 24, 1).

1025. The author of another well-known *Apologia*, Q. Septimius Florens Tertullianus of Carthage (c. 150—230), has long been recognised as a writer of rare genius, vivid imagination and passionate fervour. He has been characterised as 'ardens uir' by Jerome (*Ep.* 84, 2), who elsewhere refers to his 'acre et uehemens ingenium' (*de uir. illustr.* 53). The son of a centurion, and probably himself originally an advocate, he mingles metaphors from the camp and the law-court with the language of letters and the language of the people, and thus creates a new language to meet the new needs of the Christian Church. He is our earliest authority

for as many as 153 words ending in *-tor* or *-trix*. He not only coins new words, but he also uses old words in new meanings, while Greek idioms abound in his renderings from the Greek. His style is sometimes extraordinarily difficult; he combines the crabbed obscurity of a Persius with the vehement indignation of his own favourite authors, Juvenal and Tacitus. One of his successors, Lactantius, himself a master of a smoother type of Latinity, describes him as 'omni genere litterarum peritus, sed in eloquendo parum facilis et minus comptus et multum obscurus' (*Div. Inst.* 5, 1). Some of his briefer and simpler sentences have become proverbial:—'O testimonium animae naturaliter Christianae' (*Apol.* 17); 'semen est sanguis Christianorum' (*ib.* 50); and his paradoxical phrase:—'certum est quia impossibile est' (*De carne Christi*, 5).

1026. Cyprian (c. 200—265), who died a martyr's death as bishop of Carthage, had received, like Minucius Felix and Tertullian, a rhetorical education. It is said that he never passed a day without reading Tertullian, and that he Cyprian. often asked for his works in the words:—'da mihi magistrum' (Jerome, *De uiris illustribus*, 53). He was influenced by the thought and not by the language of his 'master', whom he far excels in the lucidity of his style and the smoothness of his diction, while, in the rhythm of his *clausulae*, he closely follows the example of Cicero. He renounces the direct citation of classical authors, though he imitates their style to enhance the stateliness of his language. In classical prose Cicero and Seneca are apparently the only authors with whom he is intimately acquainted. But he also knows his Virgil, and his own style is full of poetic elements. His normal word for 'often' is *frequenter*, with *saepius* and *saepissime* for its comparative and superlative, while *saepe* is never used except for reasons of rhythm. He avoids *mox*, and uses *cito* and *uelociter* in its place. He uses words in new forms and new meanings, and with a new syntax. He frequently expresses the oblique cases by means of prepositions, such as *de* or *ad*, and the future tense by *habere* and the infinitive; and he supplies us with the earliest example of *uelle* as a future auxiliary:—'addiderunt (martyres) non in hoc fidere ut liberari in praesentia uellent' (p. 484, 11). In the structure of his clauses he aims at symmetry, and nothing shows his rhetorical training more vividly than his use of rhythm, of rhyme, and of alliteration. He has a complete command of all the technical devices of the rhetoricians, combined with amplitude of expression, and a smooth movement of the period. His expansive sentences are seldom varied with pointed epigrams of the following type:—'madet orbis mutuo sanguine; et, homicidium cum admittunt singuli, crimen est; uirtus uocatur, cum publice geritur; impunitatem scelus acquirit non innocentiae ratio, sed saeuitiae magnitudo' (*ad Donatum*, 6). Some of his sayings have become memorable. At the outbreak of the plague in Carthage, in exhorting his flock to be never deterred by the fear of death from ministering to the dying, he bids them be true to their heritage:—'respondere nos decet natalibus nostris' (*Vita Pontii*, 9); elsewhere (*De Mortalitate*, 15) he tells them not to sorrow for the faithful departed, 'cum sciamus non eos amitti, sed praemitti',—'not lost, but gone before'. Lastly, in his letter to the martyrs imprisoned in the mines, their 'feet in blessed bondage bound' are the theme of a fine *anaphora*:—'o pedes feliciter uincti, qui non a fabro sed a Domino resoluuntur; o pedes feliciter uincti, qui itinere salutari ad paradisum diriguntur; o pedes in saeculo ad praesens ligati, ut sint semper apud Deum liberi' (*Ep.* 76, c. 2).

1027. The African rhetorician, Arnobius, in his polemical pamphlet on the polytheism of the Gentile world (c. 295), gives proof of a command of the most varied vocabulary, combined with strong and violent language, and a constant readiness to resort to rhetorical interrogation. In his Latin style, he follows the ordinary classical tradition, as opposed to the modern mannerisms of writers like Apuleius, but he is discredited by the violence of his invective. He is described by Jerome as 'inaequalis et nimis et absque operis sui partitione confusus' (*Ep.* 58, 10), while his own pupil, Lactantius, in recounting the *litterati* who had defended Christianity, preserves an impressive silence on the achievement of his master. Arnobius pointedly refers (iii 6) to Cicero *De Natura Deorum*; but he derives most of his materials from Epicureans, such as Lucretius. On antiquarian matters (for which alone

he is now of much value) he is mainly indebted to a recent writer on the Etruscan and Roman religion, Cornelius Labeo, and to Varro, 'ille Romanus multiformibus eminens disciplinis' (v 8), whom he effectively quotes in the following passage:—'Quid ergo, dixerit quispiam, sacrificia censetis nulla esse omnino facienda? Ut vobis non nostra, sed Varronis uestri sententia respondeamus, nulla' (vii 1).

1028. The fame of the Ciceronian eloquence of Arnobius' disciple, Lactantius, led to his being summoned by Diocletian from Sicca in Northern Africa to Lactantius. teach rhetoric in the new capital, Nicomedeia. When this appointment lapsed with the outbreak of the Diocletian persecution (303), Lactantius found consolation in literary work. He is prompted to compose his earliest extant treatise, *De opificio Dei* (c. 304), by the undue brevity with which human physiology had been treated by his great master, Cicero. In the course of its pages, he repeatedly quotes Virgil and refutes Lucretius. On the positive, as well as on the negative side, his *Divinae Institutiones* (307—310) owe much to Cicero *De Natura Deorum*, of which he incidentally declares, that 'the whole of the third book destroys all forms of religion'. while he repeatedly echoes Cicero's language of regretful resignation:—'utinam tam facile uera inuenire possim quam falsa conuincere' (i 91). He also quotes Lucretius and Virgil, as well as the *Fasti* and *Metamorphoses* of Ovid, besides Ennius, Plautus, Terence, Lucilius, Horace and Persius, with Varro, Sallust and Seneca. He reveals his consciousness of the importance of style, when he declares that truth must be illuminated 'claritate ac nitore sermonis', if it is to make its force fully felt. His debt to Cicero in this treatise, and in the *De ira Dei*, is so great that Jerome describes both as practically epitomes of Cicero's dialogues. The conciseness of the treatise *De moribus persecutorum* (c. 313—4), as compared with the *Institutiones*, has been explained by the difference of subject; both works agree in their vocabulary and their syntax. Of his attitude to his predecessors, it has been well said that 'it is through Cicero that he came in contact with the thought of Greece and Rome', that 'he admires Cicero as a philosopher and as a man of letters, studies his writings, and strives to imitate them. He derives his proofs from the Bible, his facts from Varro and Valerius Maximus, his grace of style from Virgil and Ovid, and his moral maxims from Seneca' (Pichon's *Étude*, 247 f, 262). At the Revival of Learning, his works were welcomed with enthusiasm by Petrarch, while Pico della Mirandola called him 'the Christian Cicero' (*Op.* p. 21, ed. 1573).

1029. The most scholarly of the Latin Fathers, Hieronymus, commonly called St Jerome (331 or 348—420), was a pupil of Aelius Donatus in Rome, studied theology at Trier and at Aquileia, and, after spending five years at Antioch and in the Syrian desert, perfected his knowledge of Greek in Constantinople. Two years later he returned to Rome, where he was secretary to Pope Damasus in 382—5. He then left for Jerusalem and Alexandria, and finally spent the last 31 years of his life in the monastery which he founded at Bethlehem.

Jerome's earliest instructor in Rome had been a leading authority on Terence and Virgil. During his illness in the Syrian desert, he found some respite in the perusal of his favourite authors, Plautus and Cicero, until he was visited by the memorable vision warning him that he was 'not a Christian, but a Ciceronian'. For a time, he renounced the reading of the ancient Classics. But, afterwards, among the boys of his school at Bethlehem, he instructed his pupils in Plautus and Terence and, above all, in Virgil, and the 'Ciceronian' and the 'Christian' were reconciled with one another. His Greek studies in Constantinople bore fruit in his Latin translation of the Chronicle of Eusebius. His return to Rome was connected with his being commissioned by the Pope to revise the Latin Bible, and the result was the celebrated version now known as the Vulgate, a work which had a profound influence on mediaeval Latin. This work was completed at Bethlehem, where he also wrote his treatise *De uiris illustribus*, in imitation of the corresponding work of Suetonius (392). His *Letters* (370—419) abound in quotations from Classical authors, and from Virgil in particular. He also cites Ennius and Naeuius, Plautus and Terence, Horace and Juvenal, as well as Cicero, Sallust, Quintilian, and Suetonius. His studious life at Bethlehem is thus described by Sulpicius Seuerus:—



'totus semper in lectione, totus in libris est; non die neque nocte requiescit; aut legit aliquid semper aut scribit' (*Dial.* i 9). He is a minute critic of the style of his opponents, and, to disarm criticism, professes to spend little pains on his own. In his controversy with Rufinus, he avows the variety of his attainments by describing himself as 'philosopher, rhetorician, grammarian, logician, and master of three languages, Hebrew and Greek and Latin' (*Adv. Rufinum*, iii 6).

1030. St Jerome's version of the Chronicle of Eusebius forms the basis of the Christian History of the world ending with 417 A.D., which was written by the Spanish presbyter, Orosius, at the request of St Augustine. It is partially compiled from Livy, Justin, Tacitus, and Suetonius, who is strangely regarded as the author of Caesar's Commentaries *De Bello Gallico*. The language also shows the influence of Virgil and of Lucan. Orosius.

The historical literature of the fourth century includes the *Caesares* of the African writer, Aurelius Victor, giving an account of all the Roman emperors down to 360 A.D. An unknown writer of a later age prefixed to this an *origo gentis Romanae*, and a work *de uiris illustribus* relating to the regal and republican periods, thus providing a complete summary of the history of Rome. Aurelius Victor.

A second compendium of Roman history was produced in 369 A.D. by Eutropius, the remembrancer of the emperor Valens. It is founded on an epitome of Livy, and on Suetonius, while the later authorities are an anonymous chronicle of the Caesars and a family-history of the house of Constantine. Eutropius. It was translated into Greek in 380. The original is written in a simple style, and has long been a popular text-book. It records the interesting fact that every Roman emperor was greeted, on his accession, with the hope that he might prove 'felicior Augusto, melior Traiano' (viii 5).

1031. In the last decade of the century, a Greek of Antioch, Ammianus Marcellinus (c. 332—c. 400), was completing in Rome his continuation of the *Histories* of Tacitus. He dealt with the period extending from the death of Domitian to the death of Valens (96—378). The extant portion covers the years 353—378, for which the author is happily a contemporary authority. He had himself seen military service in Gaul, in Northern Italy, and in Mesopotamia, and, in preparation for his historical work, he had visited the battle-fields of Thrace, Egypt, and Greece. At the close of his labours he solemnly declares that he has been guided solely by a desire to tell the truth. As a Greek soldier, he writes in a strange variety of Latin, blended with many reminiscences of the 'sayings of Cicero', and also revealing some study of Sallust and Tacitus and Florus. His style naturally abounds in Grecisms, and also betrays the influence of the 'Asiatic' rhetoric of his age Ammianus Marcellinus.

1032. Ammianus has lauded the learning and the modesty of Symmachus (c. 340—402), the consul of 391, and the devoted adherent of the ancient religion of Rome. His general character resembles that of Cicero, while his *Letters* are modelled on those of the younger Pliny. His most frequent quotations come from Cicero, Terence, and Virgil. In his day the whole of Livy was still in existence, and the interest in the historian's text, inspired by Symmachus and his family, is attested in the 'subscriptions' to the books of the first decade, which were revised by Victorianus and the Nicomachi. Fragments of his panegyrical orations have been preserved in the same palimpsest as the *De Republica* of Cicero and the correspondence of Fronto. In the third of his official reports to the emperor (384), he makes an impressive appeal for religious toleration:—'the great mystery' (he urges) 'might well be approached in more ways than one'.

This appeal was deemed of so great importance that it aroused a rejoinder on the part of the foremost Churchman of the West. The eloquence of Symmachus is attested in the following terms by his opponent, St Ambrose, bishop of Milan:—'aurea est lingua sapientium litterarum, quae phaleratis dotata sermonibus, et quodam splendentis eloquii uelut coloris pretiosi corusco resultans, capit animorum oculos specie formosi, uisusque perstringit' (*Ep.* 18, 2).

1033. The literary activity of St Ambrose (c. 340—397) extended over the last twenty years of his life. In his work on the six days of the Creation (*Exānēvon*) he tells the story of the hound of Antioch (6, 24), ascribed by Giraldus Cambrensis (*It. Cambr.* i 7) to the lost *Prata* of Suetonius, which is probably the authority for large portions of his description of the physiology of man. In the best known and the most influential of his writings, the treatise *De officiis ministrorum* (386), he directly imitates the *De Officiis* of Cicero. From Cicero he borrows the four Cardinal Virtues of Wisdom, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance, but, in quoting the ancient moralist's account of the first duty of Justice,—‘iustitiae primum munus est, ut ne cui quis noceat, nisi lacessitus iniuria’ (i 20), he censures Cicero for recognising revenge as a legitimate motive. His *Hymns*, four of which are recognised as certainly genuine (*‘Aderne rerum conditor’, ‘Deus creator omnium’, ‘Iam surgit hora tertia’, and ‘Veni redemptor gentium’*), are constructed with a strict regard for quantity, in accordance with the prosody of the classical poets of the golden age.

1034. In the very same year (384), in which Symmachus pleaded for the toleration of an expiring paganism, he recommended the young Augustine (354—430) for a professorship of rhetoric in Milan, thereby unwittingly bringing him under the beneficent influence of Ambrose. Augustine was baptised three years later, and was subsequently bishop of Hippo Regius, in North Africa, for the last 35 years of his life.

In his *Confessions* he records and regrets his early fondness for Virgil; at the age of 19, he received his first serious impressions from the study of the *Hortensius* of Cicero. In 383 he left Carthage for Rome, and in Milan, at the age of 31, we find him studying, in his quest for truth, certain ‘Platonic’ writings translated by Marius Victorinus (*A.* 350). Before leaving Milan he had begun a cyclopaedia of the liberal arts in imitation of Varro’s *Disciplinae*, all that has survived being the dialogue on Music and abridgements of the work on Grammar, with parts of the introductions to the study of Rhetoric and Logic. The work on Rhetoric was founded on Hermagoras and Cicero; that on Logic is one of our authorities on the Grammar of the Stoics. In the *De Civitate Dei*, a Christian philosophy of history, finished in 426 A.D., he quotes largely from Varro’s *Antiquitates* (especially in the account of the distinctively Roman divinities), and from Cicero’s treatise *De Republica*. He has thus preserved considerable portions of those important remains of the golden age of Latin literature.

1035. The *Dream of Scipio* in the sixth book of Cicero’s treatise *De Republica* was elaborately expounded by Macrobius towards the close of the fourth century. It is to the existence of this commentary that we owe the preservation of the original text. The commentary is completely pervaded by the spirit of Neo-Platonism, the final philosophic system of the old pagan world. The commentator’s general aim is to support Plato and Cicero in maintaining the immortality of the soul.

The other work of Macrobius, the *Saturnalia*, deals mainly with Virgil. It is in the form of a dialogue held at the house of Vettius Agorius Praetextatus, an expert in augural and pontifical law, who died in 384. As statesman, scholar, antiquarian, philosopher, and mystic, he was one of the most eminent representatives of the heathen world of Rome. Among the interlocutors were the orator Symmachus, and Seruius, the future commentator on Virgil. The discussion dwells on the varied and comprehensive merits of that poet, on his precise knowledge of religious ritual, his complete command of the resources of rhetoric, his close imitation of Homer, and his frequent indebtedness to the earlier Latin poets, concluding with a long series of verbal criticisms on the text. It is obviously Virgil’s learning rather than his poetry that appeals to Macrobius. Macrobius borrows largely from Gellius.

1036. At the dramatic date of the *Saturnalia* (c. 380), Seruius, who was born c. 355, was still a comparatively young man, who had not yet completed his Commentary on Virgil. This work, which has come down to us in the two forms of a longer and a shorter recension, owes much of its value to

its wealth of mythological, geographical, and historical or antiquarian learning. It is partly founded on materials borrowed from Cato, Varro, Nigidius, Hyginus, Verrius Flaccus, and Suetonius.

1037. Before the conquest of Northern Africa by the Vandals in 439, Martianus Capella produced an encyclopaedia of the Seven Arts in the fantastic form of an allegory representing the marriage of Mercury and Philologia, who is attended by seven bridesmaids personifying the Arts. The work (which was probably later than St Augustine's *Disciplinarum Libri*) is mainly founded on Varro's lost *Disciplinae*, and, as in Varro's *Saturae Menippeae*, the prose is often varied with verse. It was one of the favourite text-books of the Middle Ages.

Martianus  
Capella.

1038. The fourth century in Gaul is represented by Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, the opponent of Arianism in the West (d. 366), whose contact with Greek literature during the three years of his exile in the East (356-9) had, as in the case of Lactantius, a salutary effect on his Latin style. In his treatise *On the Trinity* (i 38) he prays to be endued with a knowledge of the meaning of words, and with dignity of language. He is described by St Jerome (*de uiris ill.* 100) as an imitator of Quintilian, but the elaborate prefaces to his various works are more suggestive of Sallust. It was probably his occasional relapses into the Gallic verbosity of his youth, that prompted St Jerome to say elsewhere:—'Hilarius Gallicano cothurno attollitur et, cum Graeciae floribus adornetur, longis interdum periodis inuoluitur et a lectione simpliciorum fratrum procul est' (*Ep.* 58, 10).

Hilary of  
Poitiers.

1039. Early in the fifth century the Aquitanian presbyter, Sulpicius Seuerus (c. 365—425), imitates Sallust, Velleius, and Tacitus in a Chronicle beginning with the Creation and ending with his own times. In his writings on St Martin of Tours, while he depreciates the Classics, he nevertheless makes Cicero his model, and has reminiscences of Virgil.

Sulpicius  
Seuerus.

1040. In the first half of the same century, between the capture of Carthage by the Vandals (439) and the invasion of Gaul by the Huns (451), the presbyter Saluianus of Marseilles (who attained a hale old age in 480) was prompted by the calamities of his country to compose, in a Ciceronian style resembling that of Lactantius, the memorable treatise *De gubernatione Dei*, with its gloomy presage of the approaching end of the constitution, the civilisation, and the learning of Rome.

Saluianus.

1041. In the latter half of the century the foremost representative of Latin literature in Gaul was Sidonius Apollinaris (c. 431—c. 482-4), whose father-in-law, the emperor Auitus, caused a statue of Sidonius to be placed among those of literary celebrities in the library of Trajan (455). For the last twelve years of his life Sidonius was bishop of the Auvergne.

Sidonius  
Apollinaris.

His *Letters* are modelled on those of the younger Pliny. He quotes from Virgil and Horace, from Cicero and Tacitus, and he is an admirer of Sallust. He regrets that, in his day, literature is held in esteem by few, and he laments the inroad of barbarism into the classical idioms of the Latin language. In one of his poems, which are written in hexameters, elegiacs and hendecasyllables, he shows a wide, though possibly superficial, familiarity with classical literature.

1042. In the first quarter of the sixth century there is no greater name in Latin literature than that of Boëthius (c. 480—524), the head of an ancient Roman house, and the sole consul of 510, who attained the height of his fame twelve years later, when the consulship was held by his two sons, and when their illustrious father pronounced a public panegyric on Theodoric. Not long afterwards he was arrested on the obscure and mysterious charge of designing to liberate Rome from the barbarian yoke, was cast into prison, and put to death in 524.

Boëthius.

To his own and to later generations in the Latin world he was the interpreter of all the logical treatises of Aristotle, and it was a passage in his second commentary on Porphyry's Introduction to the *Categories* that gave the first signal for the age-long conflict between the Nominalists and the Realists.

**1043.** A wider popularity was attained by the crowning work of his life, the *Philosophiae Consolatio*, which he composed in prison not long before his death. It is the noblest product of the closing age of classical literature. In this memorable work, which is in the form of a prose dialogue, intermingled with 39 brief poems in 13 different metres, the author has raised to a higher dignity a type of literature which had previously been applied to lighter themes alone by Varro, by Seneca and Petronius, and by Martianus Capella. In the phraseology of his poems he mainly imitates the tragedies of Seneca, while he also has some reminiscences of Virgil and Homer, Ovid and Juvenal. He is familiar with the *Timaeus* of Plato, with the *Physics* and *De Caelo* of Aristotle, and with the *De Divinatione* and the *Somnium Scipionis* of Cicero. Standing on the threshold of the Middle Ages, as 'the last of the Romans whom Cato or Tully would have acknowledged for their countryman', he left as his legacy to the coming centuries an eclectic manual of moral teaching severed from dogma and endued with all the charm of exquisite verse blended with lucid prose. Of its numerous translations, some are amongst the earliest literary products of the vernacular languages of modern Europe.

**1044.** His distinguished contemporary, Cassiodorus, the consul of 514 and the Secretary of Theodoric, lived beyond the age of ninety (*c.* 480—*c.* 575). The early part of his *Chronicle*, extending from the Creation to 519 A.D., is mainly an inaccurate copy of Eusebius and Prosper. A higher value attaches to his *History of the Goths* (533), now extant solely in the abridgement of Iordānes (551). In 537 he published, under the title of *Variae*, the vast collection of his official correspondence. Three years later he retired from public life and, on his ancestral estate among the Bruttii, founded the monastery of the *Vivarium*. For the benefit of its inmates, he composed an encyclopaedic work on sacred and secular learning. In the course of that work he urges copyists and revisers of classical texts to study the ancients, and to correct their texts with the aid of experts in secular literature. While St Jerome, in his cell at Bethlehem, had set the first great example of isolated literary labour, Cassiodorus was apparently the first to make the cultivation of learning part of the systematic organisation of the common life of the convent, and thus to contribute in no small measure to the preservation of the ancient Classics.

**1045.** The last of the grammarians from whom Cassiodorus compiled his treatise on *Orthography* was Priscian, a transcript of whose great work on *Grammar* was completed at Constantinople



by one of his pupils in 526-7. It is divided into XVIII books; I—XVI on Accidence; XVII and XVIII on Syntax. It is largely founded on the Greek of Apollonius Dyscolus. Most of the author's Latin learning comes from Flavius Caper; much is also due to Charisius, Diomedes, Donatus and Probus. The work is remarkably rich in quotations from Cicero and Sallust; also from Plautus, Terence, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, Persius, Statius, and Juvenal. There are fewer from Cato, and from Accius, Ennius, or Lucretius; very few from Catullus or Propertius, Caesar or the elder Pliny; and none from Tibullus or Tacitus.

1046. Of St Benedict and the Benedictine rule there is no mention in Cassiodorus, but, more than ten years before Cassiodorus founded his monastery on the bay of Squillace, Benedict of Nursia (480—c. 542), who belonged to the same Anician gens as Boëthius, had founded the monastery of Monte Cassino amid the ruins of an ancient temple of Apollo. The close of the Roman Age of Latin literature is marked by the death of Boëthius (524), while the Middle Ages may be regarded as approximately beginning with the foundation of Monte Cassino (529), the earliest home of an order which afterwards became conspicuous for its services to learning. In the East, the very same year was marked by the closing of the School of Athens, and the publication of the *Code* of Justinian. Between 529, the date of the publication of that *Code*, and 533, the date of the completion of the *Digest* and the *Institutes*, the legal learning of the past was summed up and reduced to a systematic form, while the old Roman Law of the Twelve Tables was finally superseded.

I. *Histories of Roman (or Latin) Literature.* Bernhardt, *Grundriss der römischen Litteratur*, ed. 5, 1872. Teuffel-Schwabe, *Geschichte der röm. Litt.*, ed. 5, 1890 (new ed. in 3 vols., vol. ii, 1910), E. T. by G. C. W. Warr, 1900. Schanz, *Gesch. der röm. Litt.* in 7 vols., 1890—*Shorter Histories.* Wilkins, (*Primer of*) *Roman Literature*, 1890. Mackail, *Latin Literature*, ed. 3, 1899. Cruttwell, *Roman Literature to the death of M. Aurelius*, ed. 6, 1898. Middleton-Mills, *The Student's Companion to Latin Authors*, 1900. Leo and Norden in the German Encyclopaedia, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, I viii (ed. 2, 1907), 313—411. Norden and Wendland in Gercke and Norden's *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, I (1910) 451—546. Zoeller-Martini, *Grundriss der Gesch. der röm. Lit.* (to the end of the fifth cent.), vol. i, 1910. Manitius, *Lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, 1911—

Chapters on Literature in Mommsen's *Roman History*, Heitland's *Roman Republic* (1910), Schiller's *Kaiserzeit* (1883), Merivale's *Romans under the Empire*, and Bury's *Student's Roman Empire* (1893).

II. *Works illustrating special departments or periods.* These lists are mainly limited to books likely to be found useful by students.

Sellar, (1) *The Roman Poets of the Republic*, ed. 3, 1889, (2) *Virgil*, 1891, (3) *Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, 1892. Tyrrell, *Latin Poetry*, 1895. J. Wight Duff, *Literary History of Rome* (to the close of the Golden Age), 1909. H. E. Butler, *Post-Augustan Poetry* (from Seneca to Juvenal), 1909. Nettleship, *Essays*, 2 vols. 1885-95. Forsyth, *Life of Cicero*, 1867. Strachan-Davidson,

*Life of Cicero*, 1894. Essays in Tyrrell and Purser's ed. of Cicero's *Correspondence*, 1879—1900; Introductions to *De Oratore*, ed. Wilkins, 1888<sup>2</sup>; *Orator*, ed. Sandys, 1885; *Academica*, ed. Reid, 1885. T. R. Glover, (1) *Studies in Virgil*, ed. 2, 1910, (2) *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, 1901. Dill, *Roman Society* (1) from Nero to M. Aurelius, ed. 2, 1905, (2) in the last century of the Western Empire, 1898 (ed. 3, 1905 etc.). E. W. Watson, *Language and Style of St Cyprian* (in Oxford *Studia Biblica* etc.), 1896. Hodgkin, *Claudian, the last of the Roman Poets*, 1875.

Lamarre, *Hist. de la lit. lat.* (to the end of the Augustan age), 8 vols., 1901—7. Boissier, (1) *Cicéron et ses amis*, E. T. ed. 3, 1908, (2) *Nouvelles Promenades Archéologiques, Horace et Virgile*, 1886, (3) *Tacite*, E. T. 1906, (4) *Fin du Paganisme*, ed. 5, 1907. Plessis, *La poésie latine de Liv. Andron. à Rut. Nam.*, 1909. Patin, *Études sur la poésie latine*, 2 vols., 1868—9. Nisard, *Les poètes latins de la décadence*, 1834 etc. Martha, *Les moralistes sous l'empire romain*, ed. 5, 1886. Goumy, *Les Latins*, 1892. Monceaux, (1) *Les Africains (paiens)*, 1894, (2) *Hist. Litt. de l'Afrique Chrétienne*, vols. i—iii, 1901—5. Roger, *L'Enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin*, 1905.

Ribbeck, *Geschichte der röm. Dichtung*, vols. i—ii ed. 2, 1894—1900; vol. iii, 1892 (Fr. T. of vols. i, ii, 1891). Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, 1895. Heinze, *Vergils epische Technik*, ed. 2, 1908. Teuffel, *Studien und Charakteristiken*, ed. 2, 1889. Hirzel, *Der Dialog*, vol. 2, 1895. Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa*, 2 vols. 1898, ed. 2, 1909. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, ed. 3, 1912. Curt Wachsmuth, *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*, 1895, pp. 588—704. Weissenborn, *Einleitung* to Livy, ed. 9, 1908. Soltau, (1) *Die Anfänge der röm. Geschichtschreibung*, 1909; (2) *Livius' Geschichtswerk, seine Komposition und seine Quellen*, 1897 (cp. Schanz, § 325). Hermann Peter, *Die geschichtliche Litteratur über die röm. Kaiserzeit*, 2 vols. 1897. Vildhaut, *Handbuch der Quellenkunde zur röm. Geschichte*, 1908.

Bibliography in Hübner-Mayor's *Bibliographical Clue*, 1875, and, since 1874, in the *Bibliotheca Philologica Classica*, published quarterly by Reisland, Leipzig. Bibliography of Cicero, by Deschamps, *Essai bibliographique*, 1863; of Persius by Morris H. Morgan (Cambridge, Mass. 1909); of Petronius by Gaselee (Bibliogr. Soc. 1910); and of Tibullus by Cartault, 1906. Bibliography of works on Latin Literature in Schanz, i (1906) 6—8, and of select monographs on each author in Teuffel, Schanz, or Zoeller-Martini.

The above chapter was in type early in 1909, but several subsequent publications have been mentioned in the notes or in the bibliography.

## VIII. 2. ROMAN PHILOSOPHY.

1047. PHILOSOPHY, on its first introduction into Rome in the wake of Greek literature, art and science, encountered fierce opposition, but the personal influence of the younger Scipio and his friends procured the new learning a hearing; and the teachers, notably Panaetius, had the tact to keep abstruse speculation out of sight and present their subject to their Roman pupils on its practical and literary side. Each of the three Schools most prominent at the time, the Stoic, the Epicurean and the New Academy, gained some adherents, but the influence of the first was undoubtedly the greatest and the most permanent. It has been well said that the heroes of the early Republic were unconscious Stoics, and no sooner was this system of moral philosophy made intelligible to cultivated Romans than it exercised an irresistible attraction. In a time when religious belief was decaying, the best intellects welcomed in its place a doctrine which had so strong an affinity with the national character: there was a sort of informal alliance between the public policy and the philosophic convictions of such a man as Cato. But, though philosophy had its triumphs at Rome, it never quite shook off the national prejudice. Having been committed to the Republican cause by Cato, the Stoics were generally in opposition during the early Empire, and more than once the government, as a precautionary measure, banished philosophers from Rome. The educational value of philosophic study was, indeed, recognised, and its wide influence is attested by much of the best literature. But zeal on the part of the pupils never supplied the lack of initiative; they had no ambition to found new schools of thought, originality was confined either to the choice of a system (thus Varro selected the Old Academy out of 288 possible systems), or to the arbitrary fitting together of various parts from different systems, according to the individual's own caprice. In confining their attention to popular philosophy and to practical questions, the Roman students conformed to, and by their adhesion strengthened, a tendency already powerful in the later Greek schools, where the controversies of centuries had led to scepticism on the one hand and eclecticism on the other.

A branch of  
general  
culture.

1048. The doctrine of Epicurus at the very outset excited general interest in Italy and was for a time exceedingly popular. Cicero tells us that crude translations of Epicurean textbooks, written in a wretched style by Amafinius and others, enjoyed a wide circulation (*Acad.* i 5, 6; *Tusc. Disp.* i 6, ii 7, iv 6 f; *Ad Fam.* xv 19, 2). Curiosity fastened on a theory which offered explanations of all the natural phenomena, especially those which have ever excited awe and dread in the popular mind. The poem of Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, which superseded these earlier efforts, was the fruit of a thorough

Epicureanism:  
Lucretius.

study and complete assimilation of the system, which he embraced with the passionate enthusiasm of a religious convert. We are compensated for the almost total loss of the voluminous works of Epicurus himself by the matchless exposition of his Roman pupil. The first two books lay down the main principles of the system and trace the process by which the world was formed, the next deals with the soul, in Book iv the difficult problem of perception is grappled with, and the rest of the poem deals with celestial phenomena, and generally with what is infrequent and obscure in the order of Nature. One of the most interesting parts of the poem is the passage (v 780 ff) in which is traced the gradual progress of mankind and the growth of civil society. (Cp. § 915 f *supra*.)

1049. Epicurus adopted fully the common principle of the Greek physicists that every event has a natural cause (*ex nihilo nihil*), which it is the business of the inquirer to discover. He fully recognised that the laws

Matter and  
void.

of nature are constant (i 592—598). From Democritus he took over the atomic theory, which postulates two ultimate existences:—matter, and void space, both constant and indestructible. Void exists no less than matter: all nature consists of void and matter, and nothing is ever added to the sum of things, nothing is annihilated. But matter or body must be carefully distinguished from what we call ‘things’. Matter is the general term for the infinity of minute indivisible solids, which are the indestructible constituents of ‘things’. ‘Things’, in spite of their seeming solidity, are aggregates, containing void

Atoms.

space within them as well as solid matter. It is from the atoms of solid matter within them that such aggregates derive the name of bodies. Each atom is a little kernel, perfectly solid and therefore indestructible; for, being without void, it does not admit the disintegrating agency of wet, cold and fire. Besides being solid, unchangeable, everlasting, it has the property of rebounding after impact, now known as ‘elasticity’. Being extended, it can be conceived as having parts, but the atom is not a compound of these parts, which are inseparable from it. Atoms differ in shape, size and weight, such difference being due to the different disposition of their least parts. The number of atoms of each shape is infinite; the number of the different shapes, though large, is finite; sometimes, as in ‘red’, in ‘fire’ and in ‘lightning’, atoms are spherical. They are too small to be perceived by sense, we discern them by reason alone. The aggregates, or things which are made up of atoms, have many secondary qualities, e.g. colour, taste, hardness or softness, heat or cold, sound, and odour, but none of these belong to the atoms. Lucretius argues that, if we postulate solid atoms, soft, porous bodies can be explained by the presence in them of void, and hard bodies by the closer union of the atoms, whereas, on the assumption that the first principles of things are not solid atoms, but porous, and therefore soft, it would be impossible to explain the hardness of bodies (i 565—576); further, that the constancy of the phenomena of nature necessarily implies the unchangeableness of the



atoms (i 584—598). The most marvellous property of the atom is its mobility. Matter does not cohere inseparably massed together :

atoms are in ceaseless motion. After collision they can never stop, but rebound in an opposite direction, with the original velocity unaltered. If atoms ever stopped, this would mean the destruction of matter. Even when combined, they are still in motion. If some rebound within very narrow limits, they must move to and fro oftener than those which form more porous bodies ; for the velocity of atoms in a mass of stone or iron is as great as when they are streaming through the void. To Lucretius, as to modern science, heat is a mode of motion ; indeed, he conceived life itself as a mode of motion and the difference of atomic structure in any two substances as sufficient to account for any difference in their qualities, even for that between the living and the lifeless. The inherent motion of the atom is in parallel lines downward ; at least, it *would* be so, but for a capricious tendency of individual atoms to swerve ever so slightly from the perpendicular. This *clināmen* must be assumed in order to account for the fact that atoms moving with uniform velocity in one direction ever came into collision at all (ii 216—250). Given that collision, the gradual process by which a world like ours was evolved can be traced step by step with inexorable consistency. Here,

Motion.

The world.

as elsewhere, Lucretius refused to see any evidence of design : he held firmly that, if atoms exist, the world must have made itself. By a 'world' he means a system containing an earth, a heaven and heavenly bodies, with the ether as a barrier to protect it against danger from without. Relatively, the earth is a large part of this world and occupies a large part of the space within it ; for Epicurus trusted his senses so far as to believe that the apparent size of the heavenly bodies was approximately their real size (v 564). From the infinite void, which contains an infinity of worlds, some like our world, others unlike it, there is a constant stream of the fresh atoms necessary to repair the waste which is constantly going on. Our world and all worlds had a beginning and will have an end, its structure is already decaying and it will one day be once more reduced to its constituent and imperishable atoms.

1050. The soul is mortal : it is as much corporeal as the body of the animal, but its matter is incomparably finer, some of its constituents are not found in inanimate things, and it is the

The soul.

unique character of its composition which accounts for the motions of sensation (*sensiferi motus*). Soul, as sentient (*anima*), is diffused all over the body, but its principal part (*animus, mens*) has its seat in the breast : the two, however, form a single nature. Of the four kinds of atoms composing the soul, the first to feel are those of the fourth nameless substance : their motions are the sensations, which are transmitted to the atoms of heat, then to those of wind, then to those of air, and finally to those of the whole body. The beating of the heart in fear or joy proves that, like thought and will, the passions have their seat in the *animus*, where soul-atoms are con-

densed and give rise to a greater variety of complex motions. The

Perception.

processes of sensation and intellect are alike explained on the assumption of contact between the material soul and the material object. In some of the senses (sight, hearing and smell), and in imagination, memory and thought, contact is not directly with the external object itself, but with a film or husk given off by the object, which travels through the intervening space and is lodged in the sense-organ or the mind. It is necessary to assume that all bodies are constantly giving off such films or emanations (*simulacra*, εἰδωλα) of infinitesimal depth or thickness, but preserving more or less faithfully the superficial shape of the bodies which discharge them. The constant emission of particles by *radium* may serve to illustrate this hypothesis. It is in keeping with the rest of the system that Epicurus derived all knowledge from the senses: no one sense could correct another, for their objects are different: nor could reason correct impressions of sense, for reason is ultimately derived from sense. This implicit trust in sense made Epicurus sceptical of the mathematical sciences, which he supposed to contradict it; and the current views on astronomy he rejected, whenever they conflicted with the evidence of the senses. He demanded clear and explicit testimony for every inference; and, if this could not be given, his conception of physical research was limited to the suggestion of means by which, without contradicting known facts, the phenomena in question might have come about. He preferred, where possible, several explanations, and left us to take our choice. In ethics, he was a hedonist: the pleasure of the agent is the only standard of conduct (Cic. *De Finibus*, i and ii). But pleasure is an ambiguous

Ethics.

term, and it is not the excitement of the moment, but the calm feeling of satisfaction, which succeeds the removal of discomfort, which he set up as the end. Human misery springs largely from unsatisfied wants: natural desires are easily satisfied, some desires are unnecessary and ought not to be gratified. This is still more true of the whole class of artificial or conventional desires, which are stimulated by idle fancy and the opinion of others, the gratification bringing the agent no direct pleasure at all. Ambition and the love of fame are illustrations. Justice is entirely conventional, but the agent finds his advantage in fulfilling contracts and obeying authority, for 'honesty is the best policy'. Virtue should be pursued, not as an end in itself, but as a means (indeed, as society is constituted, a necessary and indispensable means) to happiness, which, as

The gods.

we have seen, means tranquil pleasure. The existence of gods is guaranteed by our ideas and imaginations of them, which must have an external cause. They are blessed and immortal beings, inhabiting the *intermundia*, or interspaces between world and world, and taking no part in the government of the world, a task which would effectually interfere with their happiness. On friendship Epicurus

Friendship.

laid especial stress: it guaranteed the highest and purest pleasure. The members of his school were to be a band of brothers and,

at the cost of some inconsistency, he maintained that on behalf of a friend the wise man would even dare to die.

1051. The interest of **Cicero** in philosophic studies was life-long and sincere. He had good opportunities for becoming acquainted with all the schools and had heard most of the leading men. Cicero.

His reading was wide and directed by the ambition of adding a new department to Roman literature. In the proems or introductions to his dialogues, he combats the current opinion that the public were not interested in philosophy and that it could not be effectively expounded in Latin. His own contributions were, as he tells Atticus (*Ad Att.* xii 52), translations: 'ἀπόγραφα sunt, ... uerba tantum adfero, quibus abundo'. He also supplied the setting and the numerous illustrations from Roman life and history. He had no original views to publish, he merely expounded those of others, taking them from some received Greek authority, Panaetius in *De Officiis*, and possibly Hēcāto in the *De Finibus*. But, for exposition, he had a rare talent and uncommon advantages; and, for all the haste with which he wrote, he was fired with enthusiasm for his subject and with the desire to produce a really good book upon it. (Cp. § 972 *supra*.)

1052. As Cicero professed himself an adherent of the New Academy, it is necessary to explain the meaning of the term before we proceed to consider his exact relation to contemporary thought. Plato's school, after the death of its founder, had passed through many vicissitudes. For a time the teaching was dogmatic and mainly ethical, the peculiar Platonic metaphysics being either greatly modified or quietly dropped. In this phase it is known as the *Old Academy*. This dogmatic teaching was abandoned by Arcēsīlas (died 240 B.C.), under whose headship the school became the home of scepticism, by which is meant free inquiry, unbiassed by any positive conviction. As much could be advanced for, as against, any opinion under discussion, and the wise man, renouncing absolute knowledge as unattainable, held his judgement in abeyance (ἐποχή).

This sceptical phase is known generally as the New Academy. Sometimes, however, Arcesilas and his immediate successors are called the *Middle Academy*, and the *New Academy* proper is made to begin a century later with Carnēādes (214—129), the most gifted of all the successors of Plato. Arcesilas and Carneades both contended that, in their scepticism, they were the legitimate heirs of the Socratic and Platonic tradition. But it was one thing to maintain with Arcesilas the abstract thesis that knowledge is unattainable: it was another and harder task to prove by argument that it had not been attained. Carneades essayed this task. He undertook to overthrow the existing dogmatic systems by a refutation of their dogmas in detail, and the negative dialectic with which he attacked them made him the terror of all his contemporaries, particularly the Stoics. At the same time, he developed a doctrine of probability which, so far as action was concerned, served as a substitute for the certainty which he regarded as beyond our reach. In the long run,

The New  
Academy.

however, simple agnosticism failed to satisfy the tendency of the time, which became ever more distinctively eclectic and sought to discover in the different schools a common basis for practical morality. Some concessions to dogmatism were made by Philo of Larissa (c. 88): things, he said, were in their own nature knowable, but not by the standard of knowledge which the Stoics proposed. His disciple, Antiochus of Ascalon (c. 78), weary of a hopeless struggle, at length recanted his agnostic errors and declared knowledge to be possible. In thus violently breaking with the sceptical tradition of the past two centuries, he professed to revive the *Old Academy*, but the staple element of his eclectic doctrine was distinctively Stoic, although, in defiance of plain historical fact, he accused the Stoics of having borrowed it without acknowledgement from the Academy.

1053. In Cicero's case there is a wide gulf between speculative inquiries in general and their particular application to morals. On the theoretical issue, he remained loyal to the scepticism, or rather agnosticism, of Carneades. He was equally opposed to the compromise of Philo and the downright surrender of Antiochus. He valued highly the privilege of criticising all opinions without being committed unreservedly to the defence of any, a privilege which a barrister above all men would appreciate. Nothing can be *known*, but one opinion may be maintained as more *probable* than another. When, however, we come to questions of law and morality, the case is different. The use which Cicero here makes of his freedom to hold whatever opinion seems probable, is a singular one. He wholly dissociates himself from the negative views of Carneades. Nothing had done so much to prejudice the average Roman against philosophy at the very outset as the versatility with which Carneades on two successive days advocated arguments, first for, and then against, the obligations of justice. With such an attitude Cicero had no sympathy, any more than with the utilitarian ethics of Epicurus. A violent reaction against both led him at first to accept the eclecticism of Antiochus, but gradually he approximated more closely to the Stoics, whose rigid consistency and moral idealism had an attraction for him, as for other Romans, in spite of the hard criticism which he passed upon them. Hence, in reviewing his opinions, we have to distinguish the pupil of Carneades, in the *Academica*, *De Natura Deorum*, *De Divinatione* and *De Fato*, from the pupil of Antiochus, in *De Legibus* and *De Finibus*, and from the defender of Stoic ethics in the *Tusculans* and *De Officiis*. We can never be sure, however, whether any opinion advanced in Cicero's works is really his own, and he protests emphatically that he is not bound by previous utterances and that it is a mistake to fasten upon himself the inconsistencies of his different writings (*Tusc.* v 33 and 82 f)<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> How difficult it is, in the absence of a trustworthy clue, to infer from internal evidence what authority he is at the time following may be seen from one instance. In the *Tusculan Disputations* the preference is given to the Stoic conception of emotion, as something, in its own nature, vicious, and therefore to be eradicated. The more



1054. In the current view, there were two great problems of philosophy, one theoretical, the criterion of truth, the other practical, the end of action. With the first of these Cicero deals in the *Academica*. The question discussed is whether knowledge is possible, and the single book of the earlier edition now extant gives the arguments of the dogmatist for, and of the agnostic (in the person of Cicero) against, this possibility. The former points to the body of received truth possessed by the arts and sciences and insists on the suicidal inconsistency of the Sceptic in maintaining, whether dogmatically or otherwise, that knowledge is impossible. Moreover, such a view paralyses action, brings man to the level of a machine, and renders definition impossible. But the stress of the Carneadean onslaught had reduced the dogmatists to the defensive, and much space is devoted to an examination of those facts of experience (hallucinations, dreams, delusions of the insane) from which the inference was apparently irresistible that there was no criterion for discriminating the true from the false. On this issue, the reply of the agnostic is overwhelming. The position of the Epicurean, who placed implicit faith in the senses, is intelligible, that of the Sceptic, who distrusted them all, is likewise intelligible, but a dogmatist has to base knowledge on the senses, while at the same time admitting that they are sometimes deceived. That this is impossible is shown in detail. For action, again, Cicero insists that probability is just as good a guide as knowledge. Lastly, in a review of the entire history of philosophy, he dwells with evident delight upon the inconsistent and sometimes absurd opinions on every conceivable subject advanced by different Schools. What, then, becomes of that body of received truth which is the common possession of the sciences? The exact impression which the treatise *De Natura Deorum* was intended to leave on the reader, is not quite clear. The honours of debate rest with the negative critic, although the author professes his own sympathy with the Stoic supporter of orthodoxy. The theological views of the two great contemporary Schools, the Stoic and the Epicurean, are alone seriously expounded, and are in turn subjected to merciless criticism at the hands of the New Academy, represented by Cotta. In *De Divinatione* and *De Fato* (the latter a fragment) the treatment is very similar. A Stoic doctrine, in the one case divination, in the other fate, is first expounded and then riddled with all the skill and ingenuity of that negative criticism in which Carneades excelled.

The criterion  
of truth :  
*Academica*.

1055. The other chief problem of philosophy was a practical one : what is the chief good? This forms the subject of *De Finibus*. The Epicurean doctrine that pleasure is the end of action is expounded in Book I and refuted from Stoic sources in Book II. Stoicism finds a champion and exponent in the person of Cato

End of action :  
*De Finibus*.

moderate doctrine of the Academy, which permitted emotion to be indulged within bounds, is rejected. Yet, in spite of this Stoic tinge, some scholars contend that this treatise is modelled upon a work by the Academic Philo.

in Book III. The reply of Cicero in Book IV is on the lines of Antiochus, embodying his unhistorical assumption that there was no real difference on ethics between the Stoics and the Old Academy, and that Zeno stole the doctrines of his predecessors and invented a crabbed terminology to conceal the theft. The views of Antiochus on the whole question of the chief good are presented as a positive doctrine in Book V. He did not hold with the Stoics that virtue alone is self-sufficient for happiness; the complex nature of man requires that he should be adequately furnished with corporeal and external, as well as with mental, goods. Nevertheless, virtue is the supreme, though not the only, good. In the earlier unfinished work, *De Legibus*, law is treated from the same Antiochean standpoint but with closer approximation to Stoicism, and the New Academy is quietly snubbed (i 39). Cicero is sometimes said to have been the first to state explicitly that all men have innate moral ideas (*notiones innatae, natura nobis insitae*), and that the belief in the existence and immortality of God is found in mankind everywhere (*consensus gentium*). But, on closer examination, we discover that Cicero's innate ideas are merely his somewhat rhetorical way of presenting the Stoic conception of *ἐννοιαί* or *προλήψεις*, and, as these are similarly developed in normal man everywhere, the Stoics often employed the argument from *consensus gentium*.

**1056.** Cicero's accuracy has often been impugned. But, setting aside the carelessness inevitable in hasty writing (*e.g. Acad. Post.* i 37), the graver charge has not been substantiated. He is our earliest authority for the later Greek systems; at the time he wrote, the Stoa and the Academy had passed through many phases of doctrine, and, except in a few cases where he cites his authority, it is not easy to determine which phase or which philosopher he is reporting. As a mere question of probability, the chances are far greater that his statements are accurate than that we have the means of correcting them. His very dependence upon his sources (of which the translation of part of Plato's *Timaeus* for the purpose of insertion in some work contemplated, but never written, is a proof), makes his philosophical writings a treasure-house of invaluable fragments and *testimonia*.

**1057.** In the history of Stoicism it is usual to distinguish three periods. In the first, from Zeno (c. 350—264) to the death of Chrysippus (c. 208—4), the theory was elaborated. The next two centuries form a period of transition, during which the older doctrines were modified, simplified and occasionally relaxed in an eclectic spirit: it was in this modified form that they began to be taught at Rome. In the last period, under the Empire, the practical Roman intellect made its influence felt by a reaction against scientific theory altogether.

**1058.** Zeno (*ob.* 264), the founder of the school, adopted the famous threefold division of philosophy into (1) logic, (2) physics including psychology and theology, and (3) ethics. Logic is a mere propaedeutic of philosophy, its most important func-

Accuracy.

Three periods  
of Stoicism.

Early  
Stoicism.

tion being to determine what is the standard of truth. The Stoics adopted an empirical theory of knowledge; not, however, without concessions to rationalism. At first, we are told, they were content with right reason as the standard, but, as their doctrine became definitely more materialistic, they looked for their criterion in sensation, empirical notions or pre-conceptions, as well as in *πολύψεις* (*notiones, notitiae*). The presentations or impressions (*αἰσα, φαντασίαι*), which the senses convey to the mind, are often erroneous. A certain peculiar definiteness, a degree of force, in impressions is the ultimate test of their truth, because it satisfies us, immediately and irresistibly, that such an impression must proceed from a real object and agree with it and could not have been produced by an unreal object. When this is the case, the mind, itself active, by giving assent (*αἰσενσις, συγκατάθεσις*) to the impression, grasps and apprehends a real object. Like all the later Schools, the Stoics were materialists. Nothing exists but body, for body alone is capable of acting and being acted upon.

The criterion  
of truth.

Physics.

At the same time, any mechanical explanation of the universe, such as that of Epicurus, is insufficient, and must give place to a teleological explanation. Everywhere we see the adaptation of means to ends: as in human actions, so in nature, every event fulfils a purpose. If this teleology is combined with dynamic materialism, the result is monism or pantheism. What ultimately exists is at once spirit and matter, or, in other words, spirit is itself one, the purest, form of matter, viz. ether. We must conceive it as fiery breath and carefully distinguish it, as the element of warmth, by which all life is sustained, from the destroying fire which we know upon earth. This divine primitive substance may either remain what it is in its purity, or it may be transformed by perpetual succession into its various modifications, the four elements, out of which all particular things, all bodies, animate or inanimate, are formed. All of them are permeated by the divine ether or spirit in varying degrees of tension. This identical essence, manifested in diverse forms in everything that exists, makes the universe one. Moreover, its unity is not that of casual aggregation: it forms an organic whole, to which all the parts are so related that they are in mutual sympathy; and, whatever directly affects one member, affects them all. For the world is a living being, an animal, 'whose body Nature is, and God the soul'. It is both sentient and intelligent. By intelligence it controls and directs all that happens; whether it be called Reason, Providence, Nature, or Fate, makes no difference. God is meant by all these terms, and God is the living universe. The creation, development, and ultimate destruction of this universe, are all phases in the life of this eternal Being. By the unceasing law of fate a time will come when the world and all that it contains will be merged in the primeval fire, only to be created anew, when it will run identically the same course as before.

Pantheism.

<sup>1</sup> Pope's *Essay on Man*, i 268.

**1059.** The parallel between the individual and the universe, the microcosm and the macrocosm, is best seen in psychology.  
**The soul.**

As God is, in essence, fiery breath, the soul of the universe, so the soul which holds together and moves the human body is a fiery breath or sentient exhalation, fed by exhalations from the blood. Here is a striking contrast with the Epicurean psychology. In both systems the soul is corporeal, but, in that of Epicurus, life, sensation and reason are produced from lifeless atoms, themselves devoid of sensation and reason. According to the Stoics, the soul grows to the perfection of reason with the growth of the body. Its essence is one, its varying functions being conditioned by the varying degrees of tension in its substance. There can be no distinct parts of the soul, as maintained by Plato and Aristotle; and, when the Stoics speak of eight parts, they are careful to explain them as currents or channels, permeating the whole body and connecting the ruling principle (*ἡγεμονικόν*) in the heart with the extremities. The soul is not immortal, but after separation from the body the souls of the wise endure for a time, viz., until the general conflagration at the end of the present cycle of existence.

**1060.** On this groundwork of physics the Stoics based their ethical doctrine. Good, the end of life, is defined as agreement  
**Ethics.** with nature—whether the individual nature of man or, as Cleanthes maintained, the nature of the universe, had been left undefined by Zeno. Chrysippus held that the term ‘nature’ embraced both. This harmony with nature consists in virtue. Virtue is the one unconditional good, good at all times and under all circumstances. Similarly, vice is absolutely and at all times evil. All intermediate things are morally indifferent (*indifferentia*, ἀδιάφορα), but have degrees of worth and worthlessness, positive and negative value (*aestimatio*, *inaestimatio*), according as they are in conformity with, or contrary to, nature. Such value as belongs to things indifferent, is not a permanent attribute, but is contingent upon circumstances: so that what at one time accords with nature, may at another time conflict with it. The emotions are not produced by any principle in the soul distinct from reason; for the unity of the soul would be sacrificed by the recognition of any such principle. They can only be defined as morbid states of the reason itself, due to excessive impulse and ultimately to an erroneous judgement. The soul which forms a false estimate of the value of things, is hurried by a violent and irregular movement towards fancied goods in pleasure and desire and away from fancied evils in grief and fear, these being the four leading species of emotion. The contrast here with the teaching of Plato and Aristotle is obvious. So long as parts or faculties of the soul, essentially distinct, were recognised, it was the function of the reason to regulate and control the impulses of the lower animal nature. But the Stoics deduce from the unity of the soul the unity of its activity, whether in a healthy or a morbid state. Hence they demanded no more regulation of the passions, but their entire



suppression and eradication. The absence of reason not only renders virtue impossible in the child or in the brute; it makes emotion and vice equally impossible. The truly 'wise' man performs all his actions in accordance with reason and virtue, being preserved by his wisdom from intellectual error, no less than from moral failings. Mankind are sharply divided into the two classes of the 'wise' and the 'foolish'; and, as virtue and vice admit of no degrees, every action of the former is a right action (*rectum*, κατόρθωμα), of the latter is wrong (*peccatum*, ἀμάρτημα). Here Stoicism approaches Christian ethics: the passionless sage, like the Christian saint, is set over against a world lying in wickedness. The change from the state of folly to the state of wisdom was at first regarded as an instantaneous conversion, and the question of final perseverance, or the possibility of a lapse from wisdom, had as much interest for the older Stoics as for Christian theologians.

1061. In the above meagre outline the moral idealism of the earlier Stoics is as conspicuous as the optimism of their physics. Other creeds and systems point to a brighter future, whether on earth itself or in a life beyond: Stoicism takes the world as it is, and resolutely finds it here and now perfect. It can hardly be said to have flourished in Greece. Men were repelled by its indifference to art and culture, its pedantic formalism, and uncouth terminology. Two causes profoundly altered its character and prospects; firstly, the criticism of Carneades, who fastened upon the many inconsistencies of the Stoics and compelled the more intelligent among them to reconsider their position; secondly, the necessity of modifying what was originally a speculative doctrine, to meet the needs of the Romans. The two men most instrumental in introducing philosophy to Rome were also the most considerable figures in the middle period of Stoicism and handled the traditional doctrine with great freedom.

Stoicism in  
the second  
period.

1062. Panaetius (180—111), the friend of Scipio and Laelius, came as the missionary of Hellenic culture, commending to his Roman pupils the works of Plato, whom he revered and admired, as readily as those of his Stoic predecessors. He himself diverged from orthodoxy on several points. He denied the doctrine of a general conflagration and, in consequence, the limited immortality which early Stoics had held out as the privilege of the souls of 'wise' men. He rejected the old Stoic doctrine of divination. In these deviations it is easy to trace the influence of Carneades. In ethics, he adopted a terminology less calculated to offend common sense and common prejudices. He divided virtues into two classes, theoretical and practical. Without altogether abandoning the aspiration after perfect wisdom and virtue, he recognised that his business was with those who had set out on the road to virtue, and were a long way removed from the ideal 'sage.' It was for these he wrote his treatise περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος, of which we have a paraphrase in the first two books of Cicero's

Panaetius.

*De Officiis*, dealing successively with the καλὸν or *honestum*, and the ὠφέλιμον or *utile*.

1063. Poseidōnius of Apāmēa (c. 130—46) was the pupil of Panaetius, and the last great Stoic who took an interest in theoretical philosophy, and busied himself with the positive sciences. It is probable that his work περὶ θεῶν has been used by Cicero in Book II of the *De Natura Deorum*. As regards divination and the general conflagration, he fell back upon the orthodox Stoic view. In psychology, he abandoned the strict unity of the soul, finding it impossible to explain the emotions as morbid conditions of the reason, and with Plato and Aristotle assumed an irrational part of the soul (παθητικόν) to account for them. He also maintained the immortality, and, very probably, the pre-existence, of the rational soul. Many tendencies in the later Stoics, such as Seneca and Marcus Aurelius, are explained by his influence.

1064. The Romans in general cared little for the ground-work of theory, but were profoundly interested in all which concerned religion. The Stoics from the first, while maintaining that the universe is God, had taken the popular theology under their patronage.

Rationalising and allegorising the myths, they could interpret the many divinities of the poets as all manifestations of the one supreme Being. In this defence of the truth in polytheism, etymology played a large part. Nor, again, if all events happen by divine ordinance, is it at all unreasonable to suppose that what is fore-ordained should be disclosed by God to His rational creatures through signs and portents for their warning and instruction. Upon this principle, and upon the interdependence and close sympathy existing between all parts of the one universe, was based the philosophic defence of augury, oracles and divination. This twofold attitude of the system, at once tolerant and critical, towards the popular beliefs and cults attracted the Roman statesmen who, anxious, on political grounds, to uphold the national faith, gladly accepted the assurance of the philosophers that it was an imperfect adumbration of ultimate truth. In

the Second Book *De Natura Deorum*, we find Cicero's Stoic advancing the most dissimilar arguments to prove the existence of the gods. Some of them are wholly inconclusive, such as the universal belief of mankind: for this wide-spread belief in anthropomorphic beings, resting partly on legends of their intervention in human affairs, certainly could not establish what the Stoics wished to prove, viz., that the universe itself is living, sentient, intelligent and perfect. Again, to argue from divination, auguries and oracles is to argue in a circle, for the divine existence would be assumed as the main argument in support of divination. Popular superstition might be satisfied with such grounds of belief, but the philosophical arguments, cited from Zeno and Chrysippus, are of a very different order. They start with the assumption that the universe is perfect. What has reason is better than what has not reason: therefore the universe, as the best of things, must

Attitude to  
the popular  
religion.

De Natura  
Deorum II.

possess reason. The universe as a whole must be more perfect than its parts, it must be sentient, because it has sentient parts; and intelligent, because one part, man, is intelligent. The inference is from the effect to the cause. We assume that there are everywhere the marks of adaptation and design, such as no human reason, or human power, could produce: the effects, and in particular the phenomena of the heavenly bodies, point to a cause, and this must be an intelligence superior to that of man. The scale of existence rises by gradual ascent from vegetable to animal, from animal to human existence; and, if the universe is perfect, this scale must be completed in a Being who is perpetually virtuous and wise, in whom the striving after perfection common to all finite natures finds its fulfilment. These arguments establish the divinity of the whole universe, conceived, as in Plato's *Timæus*, as spherical. But its activity is not limited to the eternal revolution of the heavenly sphere. It is displayed in the creation and government of the particular beings over whom it exerts its providence. The highest of such individual existences are the spirits of the stars, inhabiting the purest element, ether. From the point of vantage obtained by these results the gods of mythology admit of easy explanation. They are personifications either of the forces of nature, like Jupiter and Neptune; or of benefits universally enjoyed, like Ceres and Liber; of virtues and passions, like Concord, Victory, Ops and Venus; or even of departed human benefactors, like Hercules, Aesculapius and Quirinus. Here, it is easy to recognise two distinct lines of argument. The cosmological proof or argument from design is used explicitly, the ontological used implicitly, when it is assumed that the universe is perfect and *therefore* corresponds in actuality to our conception of what is perfect. The opposition of the Stoics to the Epicureans was bitter and uncompromising, and many parts of the system are best explained by contrast with Epicurean tenets. This is the case with the doctrine of providence. The working of intelligence, the adaptation of means to ends, which the Stoics saw everywhere, was fiercely denied by Epicurus. The God of the Stoics foreknows and ordains all events, even to the minutest details; the Epicureans, and agnostics like Carneades, joined issue with them, pointing to the calamities which befall the innocent and the virtuous and to notorious examples of prosperous villainy. It was easy to retort that external circumstances are not the rewards of virtue or of vice. Still, a difficulty remained in the familiar fact of 'conquered good and conquering ill', which is but a part of the larger problem, the existence of moral evil in a perfect universe. This problem the Stoics were bound to face, and they offered the best solution they could. Either, it may be said, God is the author of all things except wickedness; or, the very nature of good presupposes its contrary, evil; or, there may be a point of view from which what we call evil is not evil.

1065. The same fundamental difference of view appears, when the two Schools, at the outset of their ethical inquiries, take up the purely psycho-

logical question:—what are the objects of natural and instinctive desire? It may seem absurd to assume that any special importance for ethics can attach to observations of the unreasoning actions of children and the lower animals. However, both Schools joined in making the assumption and only differed as to the interpretation of the facts. Epicurus interpreted them as showing that every movement and action was directed to the attainment of pleasure. The Stoics asserted, on the contrary, that, not pleasure nor freedom from pain, but self-preservation, was the end

De Finibus  
III.

instinctively sought. The exposition of Stoic ethics in the Third Book *De Finibus* starts from this point. In man, as in every other animal, from the moment of birth natural impulse (*appetitus*, *ὁρμή*) prompts to self-preservation, and to the maintenance of the physical frame in its original integrity. Thus, self-love is anterior in our experience to pleasure or pain and is presupposed in all pursuit of particular pleasures or avoidance of particular pains. The objects of these early impulses, the so-called *prima naturae* (or *πρῶτα κατὰ φύσιν*), are partly corporeal, health and bodily soundness, partly mental, the knowledge which we acquire, either directly through the senses or in-

Prima  
naturae.

directly through the arts and sciences: they do not include pleasure. The phrase *prima naturae* was adopted by the Stoics from the Old Academy, and the relation to virtue of these primary natural advantages caused no little trouble, exposing them to damaging criticism. According to the strict theory of the Older School, these objects must belong to the class of things intermediate, which in themselves are neither good nor evil; no added value can make them good; any such addition is infinitesimal in comparison with the absolute value which attaches to virtue. And yet, under the pressure of controversy, the Stoics of the middle period endeavoured to bring them into some sort of connexion with the end. Cicero's Stoic speaks of them, like all things intermediate, as the field for the exercise of wisdom. Though not in themselves good, they are secondary results procured by what is moral, *honestum*, τὸ καλόν (*De Fin.* iii 31, 39, 49). Thus, all or most of the things commonly judged to be good (though the older Stoics had refused to call them so)—such as health, strength, wealth, fame—are brought within the sphere of the wise man's choice, and yet his real good still lies solely in the wisdom of the choice, and not in the thing chosen. This is illustrated by a simile:—an archer aims at a bull's eye, but his end is not the mark itself, but the manifestation of his skill in hitting it (*ib.* iii 22). The same tendency is shown in the classification of actions. Of intermediate things, those which are natural are to be preferred (*praeposita*, *προηγμένα*); their opposites, which are contrary to nature, are to be rejected (*reiecta*, *ἀποπροηγμένα*). Every action connected with the former is an

Officium.

appropriate action (*officium*, *καθήκον*), which is defined as 'any action, the performance of which admits of reasonable justification'. Reason requires us to perform such actions. The wise



man and the fool alike choose what is natural, and reject what is contrary to nature, so that here they are on common ground. Both may perform the same external act, *e.g.* of faithfully returning a deposit; it is the motive which underlies the performance which makes the difference. The action is not virtuous unless it be done with the right intention, which the possession of wisdom can alone ensure. Virtuous action is appropriate action carried to perfection, and this implies the imperfect performance (*inchoatum officium* or simply *officium*, μέσον καθήκον). It was inevitable that, as the perfect sage receded more and more into the region of the ideal, moralists should take more and more account of these appropriate actions: and this *officium* of the Stoics, and not the κατόρθωμα, forms the starting-point for the modern conception of duty. The view thus taken of appropriate action or inchoate duty admits of a very special application to the case of suicide, which was regarded as permissible, Suicide.  
for the wise and unwise alike, under stress of special external

circumstances. We must remember that the Stoics held the good to be independent of time; the temporal prolongation added no whit to happiness. Its characteristic is seasonableness (εὐκαιρία). We must further remember that life and death belong to the class of things intermediate which are submitted to the wise man's choice, and which determine all his plans. If anyone, on reviewing his external circumstances, finds that those in accord with nature preponderate, it is appropriate for him to remain in life; if the balance inclines the other way, or seems likely to do so, it is appropriate to quit life (*migrare de uita*, εὐλογος ἐξαγωγή). The door is open: nothing compels him to stay. The principle here laid down (*ib.* 60, 61) covers the case of Cato himself, and of the host of Stoics who, particularly in the reign of Nero, followed his example.

1066. It was on the social side of ethics that the Stoic theory presented the greatest contrast with that of Epicurus. The latter had Social ethics.  
no place in his scheme for a man's duties to the State, or even to his neighbours, unless they were his friends. The Epicurean sage would not marry, would not engage in politics, would not, in fact, assume any of the responsibilities of social life, from which, nevertheless, he strove to derive as much advantage for himself and his friends as possible. His motto was λάθε βιώσας. Here, however, where their opponents were weakest, the Stoics made their most original contributions to practical morality. They conceived the whole universe as a commonwealth embracing gods and men, under divine government and with a common law in virtue of the reason which man shares with God (*De Finibus*, iii 64; *De Legibus*, i 23). They taught that the general interest must be preferred to our own. They required men to maintain the obligations of the family and the State. Man was made for society, and justice has a natural basis. Men are united in social fellowship: all being God's creatures, they should observe contracts, abstain from mutual

harm, and combine to protect one another from injury. Even the tie of common humanity demands, not only just dealing, but an active benevolence and kindness. The extension of the Roman Empire approximately realised the dream of one world-wide commonwealth for civilised mankind, its members bound each to each by civil law, if not by the law of nature. The idea of an immutable law, emanating from God, reason or nature, was clearly apprehended and assimilated by the Roman Stoics.

The law  
of nature.

As divine and eternal, this law of nature is valid for all at all times and places, and is superior in authority to any positive legislation that may conflict with it. Or again, as Cicero puts it, it is the utterance of that supreme reason which is implanted in the mind of each man at birth, and, when duly developed, enjoins unmistakeably what he should or should not do (*recta ratio in iubendo et uetando*, *De Legibus*, i 33). From Cicero onwards, through a long succession of lawyers more avowedly Stoical, this conception guided Roman jurisprudence and through the praetor's edict influenced legislation. In the *ius gentium*, developed to meet the practical needs of intercourse with foreigners, Rome already possessed the germ of a law common to all nations. The great jurists of the Empire exerted themselves to bring it into conformity with what, in their judgement, a universal code should be, *id quod naturalis ratio apud omnes homines constituit*. Thus, the positive ordinances and customs of actual society were gradually merged in the rational law of an ideal community. Before the rise of imperial Rome the narrow limits of the City-State had been transcended in consequence of Alexander's conquests, and that cosmopolitan spirit, which external causes contributed to foster, exactly corresponded with the precepts of philosophy.

1067. For the later Roman Stoics we have in Latin the writings of Roman Stoics. Seneca (§§ 991-5) and in Greek the discourses of Epictetus reported by Arrian and the meditations of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. Seneca (who died in 65 A.D.) was, like most Roman Stoics, an eclectic<sup>1</sup>. He is our earliest authority (belonging to the School itself) whose writings have come down to us at first-hand and not in fragments or translations, but they are of little scientific value, partly from his eclecticism, partly from his mode of treatment. Under whatever title, dialogues, treatises, epistles, his works are substantially moral essays on practical themes. The *Naturales Quaestiones* form an exception: in them, by precept and example, the author recommends the contemplation of the wonders of nature as a means of elevating the mind. When Seneca

<sup>1</sup> It is an interesting fact that two of his philosophical teachers, Sôtiôn and Păpîrius Fabianus, were adherents of the one avowedly independent school which claimed to be of native Roman origin. Its founder, Quintus Sextius Niger (born about 70 B.C.), seems to have confined his originality to combining Pythagorean elements with a variation on Stoicism, into which he infused a fresh vigour of moral zeal and a contempt for useless dialectics. Seneca, who several times mentions him, describes him, in spite of his own denial, as a Stoic (*Ep.* 64).

does touch upon the theoretical side of Stoicism, it is in the hope of finding some novelty to interest his readers and almost in the spirit of antiquarian research, *quae scire magis iuvat quam prodest* (*Epp.* 58, 65, 89, 106). In short, his mission was to the reason and conscience of men, but it was no part of his ambition to be a thinker himself, or to make thinkers of others. Indifference to exact scientific theory and willingness to accept good moral teaching from any quarter, from Plato or Epicurus as readily as from Chrysippus, is not peculiar to Seneca, it is the common characteristic of all writers of this period. To be over-curious on speculative questions is generally regarded as reprehensible, as diverting the attention of the individual from the all-important task of his own moral improvement. Here it is worth while to note how important has become the conception of the moral life as a pilgrimage, a progress towards virtue and away from folly and vice (*progressio ad uirtutem*, προκοπή). In the eyes of the earlier Stoics, who claimed wisdom for themselves and expected others to attain to it, such a state of probation was a concession to individual weakness, and, after all, the probationer was involved in the same condemnation as the fool. How different this is in Seneca! He does not claim to be a sage himself, he is only progressing towards wisdom, and he sadly recognises that this is the common condition of humanity. How are we to emerge from the misery and folly of the world? The way to virtue is easy to find, but the life of one who treads it is a continual struggle with inward corruption. It is a campaign in which there is no repose, in preparation for which a man needs not only ascetic bodily exercise, meagre diet and coarse raiment, but the harder mental discipline of keeping a strict guard on his opinions and notions, and controlling his affections and desires. Opinions and notions, affections and impulses are in our own power (τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῶν); external circumstances, our bodies, wealth and position in the world are not in our power (τὰ οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῶν). By constant effort alone can we emerge victorious from the conflict, and build up a fixed habit and rational character. Philosophy, in the view of Seneca and Epictetus, comes to be regarded as the healer to whom men come from a sense of their weakness and disease, whose business is 'with the sick, not with the whole'. The wisdom by which she heals, needs no long dissertations or dialectical subtleties, but rather continual meditation and self-discipline. On the religious side may be noted a greater feeling of dependence upon God and the necessity of cheerfully submitting to the Divine will and acquiescing in the course of external events. 'Endurance and renunciation' is the motto of Epictetus, ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου: 'everything', says Marcus Aurelius, 'is harmonious to me which is harmonious to Thee, O Universe'. The duties of philanthropy, mildness, and forgiveness of injuries, are insisted upon. We should love men from the heart, love even those who have injured us, reflecting that they are kinsmen who err through ignorance. Tolerant judgement will be aided, if we bear in mind that he who hurts us

Progress  
towards  
virtue.

by word or deed has acted on his own opinion, not ours, and that, if he does wrong, it is *he* who suffers, for *he* is the person deceived. It is not surprising to find an underlying vein of sadness in these Roman Stoics. Their moral earnestness made them realise the misery and folly of the actual world and the obstacles to a radical reform of human nature. In some directions, however, their efforts were not unsuccessful. In particular, their insistence on the duty of a more humane treatment of slaves led the way to that gradual amelioration of slavery throughout the Roman world which Christianity afterwards completed.

Zeller's *Philosophie der Griechen*, Vol. iii 1 (Dritter Theil, Erste Abtheilung), Bibliography. has been translated into English under the titles *The Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics*, and *The History of Eclecticism in Greek Philosophy*. For Stoicism consult also Grant's essay in *The Ethics of Aristotle*, Vol. i; for the ancient authorities on Epicurus, Usener's *Epicurea*, 1887; for Lucretius, the edition of H. A. J. Munro, the more recent Italian edition of Giussani, 1896, Guyau, *La morale d'Épicure*, 1878, J. Masson, *Atomic Theory of Lucretius*, 1884, and Lucretius, *Epicurean and Poet*, 1907-9; for Cicero, Madvig's *De Finibus*, Reid's *Academica*, J. B. Mayor's *De Natura Deorum*; for Seneca and later Stoics, Martha, *Les moralistes sous l'empire romain*, ed. 5, 1886, Bonhoeffer, *Epictet und die Stoa*, 1890, and *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epictet*, 1894, S. Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, 1904. For Stoicism and Epicureanism, cp. also J. Adam's *Texts...on Greek Philosophy after Aristotle*, 1902, and R. D. Hicks, *Stoic and Epicurean* (with select bibliography), 1910; and, for Stoicism, E. V. Arnold's *Roman Stoicism*, 1911.

### VIII. 3. NATURAL HISTORY AND SCIENCE.

1068. THE knowledge which the Romans possessed on these subjects was derived, broadly speaking, from the Greeks. Only one Latin writer, the elder Pliny (23—79 A.D.), takes an independent position in *Natural History*, a term which he was apparently the first to use. He met his death while observing the eruption of Vesuvius, A.D. 79. He belongs, with Varro, to the class of Roman Encyclopaedists, and wrote many works, all of which have perished except the *Naturalis Historia*. This memorable book, the only Roman contribution to Natural Science, was compiled in two years from two thousand works, and contains twenty thousand 'noteworthy observations' in thirty-seven books. It comprises Cosmogony, Geography, Anthropology, Zoology, Botany, Medicine (especially Pharmacology) and Mineralogy, all treated with special reference to their practical utility in various crafts and arts. The whole forms a wonderful repertory of the knowledge of the ancients on these subjects. In the present place, it is only possible to consider the sections on *Natural History and Medicine*.

1069. Pliny's observations on Botany are not wanting in originality, though they lack scientific precision. He mentions about one thousand



species, many of which he must have seen and handled. Some he learnt to know in the botanic garden of a Greek physician in Rome, Antonius Castor. His references to the localities of different plants and their place in folk-lore are valuable; such, for instance, as the cult of the Mistletoe by the Druids in Gaul and Britain (xvi 249). The Zoology is more imperfect than the Botany. There are some good observations but also a good many absurd legends and fables, many of which have passed into the popular literature of Europe. His observations on precious stones, minerals, and pigments are important, in relation to the use of these substances in Medicine and the Fine Arts. He gives a long account of drugs and their uses, and quotes many popular medical receipts derived from old Roman folk-lore, which have some antiquarian interest. The great work of Pliny is, in fact, so marvellous a compendium of ancient Science that its popularity in successive ages is not surprising. Received in the Middle Ages with unquestioning belief, it was, in the subjects of which it treats, the great storehouse of knowledge for the learned world, and many parts have gone down deep into popular literature. Studied in a critical spirit, Pliny, though no longer a scientific authority, is of the highest value to the historian of Science; and his importance in this respect is likely rather to increase than diminish. (Cp. § 997 *supra*. On Seneca's *Naturales Quaestiones*, cp. § 993.)

**1070.** There is no trace of the science of number being studied or used by the Romans, except for practical purposes. Their well-known numeral system is supposed to have been derived from the Etruscans. They calculated on their fingers, and on the *ābācus*, a board or tray divided into spaces and strewn with sand. Mental arithmetic was taught in schools, at least in the time of St Augustine. But the science attained no higher development.

Science.

Mathematics.

Arithmetic.

**1071.** Geometry, in its original sense of Land-measuring, was used by the Romans, from early times, as a practical art, especially for the orientation of temples, and the laying out of camps and of cities. They used a simple levelling instrument, the *grōma*, from which writers on this subject were called *grōmāticī*. The chief of these were Frontinus, Hyginus, Balbus, Nipsus, Epaphrōditus, and Vitruvius Rufus. The lost encyclopaedia of Varro included some mathematics. Practical surveyors, *Agrimensōres*, called in earlier times *Finitōres*, formed a distinct profession or official class. Their duties were to divide and mark out the land in new colonies, and to determine the boundaries of private properties. In the latter case, they were directed by legal authority, or called in by the proprietors themselves. They obtained instruction in practical geometry from regular teachers. Whether these teachers were Greeks or not, there is no certain evidence. The great survey of the Roman Empire, meditated by Iulius Caesar, and carried out by Augustus, was entrusted to M. Vipsanius Agrippa and Balbus, showing that some

Geometry.

Romans at least were familiar with the subject. The perfection of Roman camps and roads, as seen in existing remains, is evidence of the high level to which the art was carried.

**1072.** The Romans produced no original science of Astronomy, and added nothing to what they learned from the Greeks. The imperfection of their own knowledge is shown by the extreme inaccuracy of their old Calendar (attributed to Romulus and Numa), and by the fact that their names for the constellations were, with few exceptions (such as *Septemtriones* and *Libra*), mere translations from the Greek. The earliest instance of accurate knowledge is the prediction<sup>1</sup> of an eclipse of the moon by C. Sulpicius Gallus on the eve of the battle of Pydna, 168 B.C. (Liv. xliv 37). When Iulius Caesar, as Pontifex Maximus, reformed the Calendar, though he had himself (it is said) written a book on Astronomy (Plin. xviii 57) he called in Sōsigēnēs, a Peripatetic philosopher, for scientific aid. The encyclopaedic writers, Varro and Pliny, treated of Astronomy, and it became a popular subject in the literary circles of Rome. The astronomical poems of Aratus seem, however, to have been more read than the works of Hipparchus and Ptolemy. These poems were translated into Latin by Cicero, Germanicus Caesar, and Rufus Auienus, which versions, more or less fragmentary, were first printed by Aldus in the *Astronomici Veteres* (Venice, 1499). The poem of M. Manilius, *Astronomica*, dedicated to Augustus, is the most considerable Latin work on the subject, but it is mainly on Astrology, the astronomical part being founded on Aratus. Columella, Vitruvius, C. Iulius Hyginus, also wrote on Astronomy, and so did, it is said, Andrōnicus, physician to Nero. The numerous astronomical passages in Lucretius, Virgil and Ovid (*cum sole et luna semper Aratus erit*) are well known. Although the Romans added nothing to the science of Astronomy, Astrology became very popular at Rome, as is shown by the number of penal enactments directed against astrologers, who were called Chaldaeans, or *Mathematici*. The most important astrological writer was Iulius Firmicus Maternus (4th century), whose work (*Matheseos Libri viii*) was printed in the Aldine collection, and later.

S. Günther, *Geschichte der Mathematik und der Naturwissenschaften in Alterthum*, in Iwan von Müller's *Handbuch*, v (1), ed. 2, 1894.  
**Bibliography.** Sir G. C. Lewis, *Historical Survey of the Astronomy of the Ancients*, 1862. J. L. Heiberg's chapter on *Exakte Wissenschaften und Medizin*, in Gercke and Norden's *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, ii (1910) 391—432 (dealing mainly with the Greek side of these topics), was published when pages 712—727 were already in type.

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps only the explanation; cp. Cic. *De Rep.* i 23.

## VIII. 4. MEDICINE.

**1073.** THE history of Roman Medicine falls into two clearly marked periods,—one before the introduction of Greek medicine, the other after. In the latter period it means chiefly the history of Greek medicine at Rome. The Pre-Hellenic Roman medicine is known chiefly from Cato and Pliny, from fragments of other writers, from Laws and Inscriptions, and many allusions in Latin authors.

Medicine.

Pliny's assertion (xxix 11) that the Romans, like many other nations, did without physicians, though not without medicine, for six hundred years, cannot be taken literally. The Romans, though they had framed no organised art and science of medicine (like that of the Greeks, the Egyptians or the great nations of the East), had nevertheless their own methods of dealing with diseases and injuries. These methods resembled in the main those of other peoples, ancient and modern, which have not adopted the scientific medicine originated by the Greeks. Appeal to supernatural powers was the chief resource of the ministers of the healing art. Thus, in times of pestilence, processions and special supplications of the old Roman divinities were instituted. In such proceedings, the priestly class was necessarily dominant, and thus there was no encouragement given to the growth of a distinct medical profession. But, gradually, an empirical art of rough surgery and simple domestic medicine, with some admixture of magical folk-lore, grew up; which, though largely practised by the *paterfamilias* (as in the case of Cato), had also its regular practitioners. For the word *mēdicus* is an old Roman word (not Greek), and occurs in the *Lex Aquilia* of the 3rd century B.C. Pliny gives the names of one or two old Roman physicians. This was lay-medicine, not sacerdotal. Thus the old Roman medicine consisted of three branches:—(1) Sacred rites paid to the higher Gods of Healing; (2) Deprecatory rites paid to the malevolent deities who caused special diseases; (3) An empirical popular medicine.

**1074.** Among the ancient gods of healing, the chief was *Sālus*, an old Roman or Sabine goddess, whose temple stood on the *Mons Salutaris*, one of the summits of the Quirinal. Another was the goddess *Carna*, invoked to preserve the health of the bodily organs, and spoken of by Ovid (*Fasti*, vi 101f), as protecting children from the '*strigae*' or destructive birds of the night. In the 5th century B.C., on occasion of a pestilence, a temple was dedicated to Apollo, who was later honoured as *Apollō Medicus*. Mars also was regarded as the protector against plagues and other diseases. A large number of divinities presided over married life and child-birth, such as *Carmenta*, honoured by women at the festival of the Carmentalia, *Lūcina* (Iuno), the moon-goddess, whose attributes are well known, with other

Gods of  
healing.

female and some male divinities. It has been reckoned that at least twenty gods and goddesses might exercise their powers at one child-birth<sup>1</sup>.

1075. A remarkable feature of Roman religious medicine was the recognition of special divinities as the authors of diseases. Cicero (*De Nat. Deorum*, iii 63) remarks on the impropriety of paying religious rites to the injurious powers of nature, *Febris*, *Tempestates*, *Mala Fortuna*. The goddess *Febris* must have had a special importance in a place so ravaged by fevers as Rome and its vicinity. We hear also of a *Dea Mēfitis* (for malaria), *Dea Angērōna* (for *angina*, ἀγχόνη, or inflammation of the throat); and even, it is said, *Dea Scabies* (for the itch). (In some parts of India a special goddess of small-pox is still recognised and worshipped.)

1076. The empirical domestic medicine of early Rome is known chiefly from Pliny's *Natural History* and from some fragments of Cato. Cato, with his well-known hostility to Greek learning, preferred the traditions of his forefathers and his own personal experience. He wrote a *Commentarium*, extant in Pliny's time though now lost, for the instruction of his son, whom he forbade to consult Greek physicians. There are a few medical precepts in his treatise *De agri cultura*. His therapeutic methods consisted chiefly in the use of simples, mostly herbs, with some rough surgery of wounds and injuries. Cabbage was a remedy for almost every ailment, a prescription quoted with approval by Pliny (xix 136; xx 78). Charms and incantations were also used. So, in treating a dislocation, splints made of reeds were to be applied, and at the same time certain unintelligible words were to be sung (Cato, c. 160). Pliny, though sceptical as to the value of incantations, does not omit to mention some of them (xxviii 10—21). This magical element (which the classical Greek medicine, alone of all the ancient medical systems, repudiated) formed an important part of Roman popular medicine, as it has done among other peoples, and in later ages, even to the present day. It reappears in *Marcellus Empiricus* (c. 400 A.D.), along with other medical folk-lore. We must not suppose, therefore, that, when Greek medicine was introduced into Rome, the old system was extinguished. Doubtless it remained the medical creed of the great mass of the people, among whom Greek ideas hardly penetrated.

The cardinal dates in the history of Greek medicine at Rome are the introduction of the worship of Asklēpios (293 B.C.); and the arrival of the Greek physicians, Archagathus (219 B.C.), Asclepiades (c. 100 B.C.), and Galen (163 A.D.).

1077. On the occasion of a severe pestilence at Rome, 293 B.C., the Sibylline books were consulted, and the advice thence obtained was to apply for relief to the Greek divinity, Asklēpios, at his temple in Epidaurus. The Roman envoys who proceeded thither were directed by the *Asclepiads*, or priests of the temple, to found a similar temple at Rome, and were presented with a sacred serpent, which should confer sanctity on the new

Introduction  
of Greek  
medicine.

Worship of  
Asklepios  
(Aesculapius).

<sup>1</sup> Ivan Bloch, in Neuburger and Pagel's *Geschichte der Medizin*, 1902, i 404.



shrine. Accordingly a temple was built on an island of the Tiber where the sacred creature landed (Livy, x 47; Plin. xxix 72). Apart from certain alleged miracles, the whole story is quite probable; for recent researches at Epidaurus have shown that the serpents were an essential part of the cult, and were made to appear to worshippers by special contrivances. (Richard Caton, M.D., *The Temples and Ritual of Asklepios*.) As the pestilence soon ceased, the popularity of the new sanctuary was assured; and it is probable that the cult of the God of Healing was celebrated with the same rites as at Epidaurus. Remains of baths have been found, with coins bearing the effigies of Asklepios and the serpent, and *donaria* or votive offerings in the shape of models of various parts of the body. There was a hospital for the reception of the sick, but it is not certain that this was founded before the time of Antoninus Pius. A law of Claudius orders that slaves sent to the island for cure, and neglected by their masters, should receive their freedom (Suet. *Claudius*, 25). Neither Galen nor Celsus refers to the Asclepian cult at Rome; it appears to have remained quite distinct from the regular medicine, being purely theurgic.

1078. Probably after this, Greek physicians from time to time found their way to Rome, but there is no certain record of any having done so before Archagāthus, a Spartan, who, according to Pliny (xxix 12 f), came in 219 B.C. He was favourably received, was granted the right of Roman citizenship, and had an office bought for him at the public expense. He was preeminently a surgeon; and the boldness and success with which he practised this Greek art, won for him at first the admiration of the Romans, who gave him the epithet *uulnerarius*; but the severity of his operations at length caused a revulsion of feeling, and he became known as *carnifex*. Pliny, who relates these stories, implies that Greek medicine and its practisers were generally condemned, though he admits that physicians were exempted when Greeks generally were banished from Italy. It is probable that he exaggerates the prejudices against them; and that, after the subjugation of Helias, physicians accompanied the Greek rhetoricians, artists, athletes and others who flocked to Rome as the centre of wealth and patronage. The discipline of the *gymnasia* and athletic schools implied medical aid, and these institutions must be regarded as having been, in a minor degree, medical.

Greek  
physicians in  
Rome.

Archagathus.

1079. The first eminent Greek physician at Rome was Asclēpiādēs of Prusa in Bithynia (born c. 124 B.C.). The little that is known of his life is from allusions in Pliny, Celsus and Galen. He probably came to Rome soon after 100 B.C. Pliny, whose account is prejudiced, says that he was first a teacher of rhetoric, and, finding this career unprofitable, became a physician, without previous training. The latter statement must be erroneous, and the former may only be founded on the reputation which Asclepiades acquired for eloquence and culture. He seems to have soon gained the friendship

Asclepiades.

of distinguished men, such as L. Crassus, Q. Mucius, M. Antonius. Cicero, though of a younger generation, might have known him, and in his dialogue *De Oratore* (i 62) makes Crassus refer to his eloquence, as well as his medical skill. The story of his meeting a funeral, and of his declaring that the supposed corpse was not really dead, and bringing it back to life, is evidence (if, indeed, it was not the occasion) of his popularity with the lower classes. His fame was also high in his own profession, as we see from Celsus, who often quotes him, and from Galen, who controverts his views with respect. He wrote, in Attic Greek, at least twenty medical treatises, of which the titles are known, though only a few fragments have survived. The medical theory of Asclepiades was founded on the atomic philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus. In his practice he inclined to the rule of the Stoics, 'to live according to nature'. Thus he touched the philosophy of Lucretius on the one hand; while, on the other, he gained the respect of those high-minded Romans who followed the Stoic rule. According to Asclepiades, the human body was composed of atoms, so arranged as to form passages or channels, through which the juices of the body passed. Disease consisted in a disproportion between the atoms and the passages; so that, if the latter were constricted, stoppages or congestions followed. He rejected the Hippocratic doctrine of the humours, and the conception of a *materies morbi*, which had to be eliminated by nature with the help of art. Hence he disapproved of the violent purgings and vomitings by which the Hippocratics thought to get rid of the morbid matter. His object was to remove obstructions and morbid conditions by regulating the size of the passages and the movement of the atoms; and this was to be effected chiefly by mechanical and physical means; by diet, exercise, massage, and an energetic cold-water cure. Of drugs he made little account, but he regarded wine as an almost universal remedy. His motto was to cure the patient *cito, tuto, incunde*. Pliny says that these methods of Asclepiades so commended themselves to the natural man, as to account for his great popularity (xxvi 13).

1080. The theoretical system of Asclepiades was the basis of the *Methodic school* (as developed by his followers Thëmisson, Soranus, and later, Caelius Aurelianus), the doctrines of which are even less congruous with modern medicine than the Humoral Pathology of Hippocrates and Galen. But his practical methods represent a very important side of Therapeutics, and one which is increasingly valued. Imperfectly as he is known, Asclepiades must be regarded as one of the greatest physicians of antiquity. (Cp. Hans von Vilas, *Asklepiades von Bithynien*, Wien, 1903.)

1081. A feature of Roman culture, after it was stimulated by Greek thought, was a desire for general information on all subjects; and more than one writer met this need by compiling an Encyclopaedia of all that an educated gentleman ought to know. Such was Varro's *Disciplinae*; such also, though more special, the

The Methodic School.

The Roman Encyclopaedists.

*Natural History* of Pliny; and, lastly, the work (preserved only in part) of Cornelius Celsus. His treatise *De Medicina* is the second part of a large work in six parts, the first of which was on Agriculture, the third on the Military Art, the fourth on Rhetoric, the fifth on Philosophy, the sixth on Jurisprudence. Only the second and a fragment of the fourth remain. It is generally agreed that the work on Medicine must have been written in the reign of Tiberius. Nothing is known of the life of Celsus. He is referred to as a medical author by Pliny (xx 29), by Columella, as a contemporary authority on agriculture, and by Quintilian, as a general writer of moderate ability, *mediocri uir ingenio*. It is clear that he was not a professional doctor, but a Roman patrician, who, like Cato, took medical charge of his own family and slaves. He himself refers to practice in the *ualetudinaria* or slave-infirmaries. The work of Celsus is never mentioned by any ancient medical writer, and must have been intended for the lay public. Its clear and elegant style has always been admired. It must be regarded as, in the main, a compendium of Greek medicine for Latin readers. Its Greek origin is shown by the references to, and the tacit borrowing from, the works of Hippocrates, and some Alexandrian physicians, along with writers of the Methodic school, as Asclepiades and Themison. The debt of Celsus to Hippocrates has been shown in parallel passages collected from their writings, most completely by Daremberg. The number of Greek medical terms used by Celsus is evidence in the same direction.

The *De Medicina* is divided into eight books. The *first* treats of Diet and rules of health; the *second* is of Prognosis, Diagnosis, and general Therapeutics; the *third*, of fevers and general diseases; the *fourth* takes local diseases of different parts of the body in order, from the head to the feet; the *fifth* is on treatment of general diseases by drugs; the *sixth*, on local diseases which require similar treatment; the *seventh* and *eighth* deal with surgery.

The Prooemium of the first book gives a short but masterly account of the Greek schools of Medicine, the Dogmatic, the Methodic and the Empiric, which is of great historical importance. The remainder of the first book, devoted to the means of preserving health, is the most original part of the work, being founded on his own experience in the class of society to which he himself belonged. The chief means recommended are exercise and change; alternation of town and country life, travelling, baths hot or cold, sports such as hunting, fishing, sailing, but *not* athletic exercises, which were regarded as superfluous. The regulation of diet, sleep, and rest, was necessarily to vary according to the constitution of the individual, whether strong or weak; while account was also to be taken of the season of the year, the time of life, and any tendency to some particular ailment. In general, his advice is wise and rational, and more applicable than might be supposed to the circumstances of modern life. It will never be out of date.

In the investigation of disease, Celsus lays great stress on *prognosis*; symptoms are to be studied not only for the purpose of diagnosis, but as of good or bad omen. He distinguishes acute from chronic ailments, and general diseases from local affections of particular organs. His account of general diseases, such as Fevers, Dropsy, Consumption and the like, is, as a rule, superior to his descriptions of special local affections; but, in all, the practical aim is apparent. In treatment, he starts from the principle of the rational school that the disease must first be known, and its cause inquired into, before any method of cure is adopted. He leans decidedly to dietetic and hygienic methods,

following therein Asclepiades, but (unlike that physician) attaching great importance to drugs. Indeed, he distinguishes those diseases in which dietetic treatment is of most importance from those which have to be combated by medicines. He gives a long enumeration of drugs classified according to their uses, not as objects of Natural History; and his repertory of medicinal agents is by no means to be despised. In general, his treatment, more especially of fevers and acute diseases, is simple and judicious. It is only in those diseases where a knowledge of anatomy and pathology (in the modern sense) is required, that he is (judged by our standards) less happy. The last two books, dealing with Surgery, have been much discussed, for it is a question whether the author had really performed all the operations he describes. Celsus is the earliest medical writer now known, who speaks of amputation of a limb, an operation only resorted to in extreme cases, as it was often fatal. His description of the operation for the stone has given rise to a considerable literature. Its obscurity makes it difficult to believe that it was written by an actual operator. But his account of other branches of surgery, and especially of the mechanical part, is superior, and has been highly praised by eminent surgeons.

It is curious that the work of Celsus was virtually unknown in the Middle Ages, being only casually referred to by a few writers:—Isidore of Seville, Gerbert of Aurillac (*Ep.* 169), John of Salisbury (as a writer on the military art), and Simon Januensis. A MS was discovered by Beccadelli at Siena in 1429, and another by Thomas of Sarzana (Nicholas V) at Milan in 1443; and, after the publication of the *editio princeps* at Florence in 1478, the work became extremely popular, being the most widely read and the most practically useful text-book of medicine in Europe down to comparatively modern times. (Ed. Daremberg, Leipzig, 1859, reprinted with French transl., notes and illustrations, by Védrenes, Paris, 1876; German transl. and commentary by E. Scheller, ed. Frieboes, Braunschweig, 1906.) #J. Ilberg's *A. Cornelius Celsus und die Medizin in Rom*, Leipzig, 1907, is a valuable study, intended for lay readers. Cp. § 989 *supra*.

1082. Galen (*c.* 130—*c.* 200 A.D.), the greatest Greek physician who ever

Galen.

lived in Rome, was born at Pergamum. He was the son of an architect, Nikôn, who gave him a very complete education. After studying at Alexandria and elsewhere he returned to Pergamum, but left it for Rome about 163-4. He soon became acquainted, he says, with nearly all the distinguished men of the day (ii 214-18, ed. Kühn). After three years, he left Rome in consequence of the hostility of the other physicians and returned home; but came back in 169 on the invitation of the emperors, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Declining an invitation to accompany M. Aurelius on his campaign against the Marcomanni he remained in Rome as physician to the young Commodus. During a long residence in the city he wrote many books and practised his profession, but returned at an uncertain date to Pergamum, where he continued his literary activity in old age.

The number and variety of his writings make some kind of classification necessary. The following arrangement is that of Greenhill:—

(1) Works on Anatomy and Physiology; (2) On Dietetics and Hygiene; (3) On Pathology; (4) On Diagnosis and Semeiology; (5) On Pharmacy and Materia Medica; (6) On Therapeutics including Surgery; (7) Commentaries on Hippocrates; (8) On Philosophy and Logic.

(1) Galen's great work on anatomy, *περὶ ἀνατομικῶν ἐγχειρήσεων*, *De Anatomicis Administrationibus*, is in fifteen books. The last six and part of the ninth are unknown in the original or in Latin, but are preserved only in

Anatomy.



an Arabic version. The Arabic text, with a German version, has lately been brought out by Dr Max Simon (Leipzig, 1906). The work is essentially a guide to dissection, but it is also descriptive, and is evidence of Galen's intimate and practical knowledge of the subject. It was unknown in the Middle Ages, being first partially translated into Latin in the sixteenth century.

A much better known work is *περὶ χρείας τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ σώματι μορίων*, *De Usu Partium Corporis humani*, in seventeen books<sup>1</sup>. This is a description of the human body designed especially to show the adaptation of the different parts to their functions, and thus to display the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. It is essentially teleological in aim, and might almost be described as a treatise on Natural Theology. The descriptions are often short, or merely allusive. Nevertheless, it was from this work (in a Latin version made from the Arabic) that mediæval physicians derived their idea of Galen's anatomy, and indeed almost their whole anatomical knowledge, till the revival of Anatomy in the sixteenth century. The influence of this treatise has been immense, and it is well described by Greenhill as 'a noble work'. Its chief fault is that, in endeavouring to show that every part of the body is perfectly constructed, Galen was led to strain the facts, and fall into serious errors. Thus he praises the perfect adaptation to their purpose of the human hand and foot; but tries to prove this by describing the muscles of the extremities in an *ape*, where the special peculiarities of the human structures are, of course, wanting. Galen's anatomical knowledge was, in fact, entirely derived from dissection of the lower animals, especially pigs, dogs, and apes. Human dissection was impossible; and, even to see a human skeleton, Galen recommended students to go to Alexandria. Only chance opportunities of seeing the inside of the human body occurred, such as certain surgical operations, or the hasty examination of the corpses of barbarians killed in war. Notwithstanding this drawback, Galen's anatomical writings are a monument of careful observation. They are important, as the only considerable works of the kind which have come down to us from ancient times.

1083. Galen did not conceive of Physiology as a science distinct from Anatomy. But several of his works relating to the functions of parts are distinctly physiological. The *De Usu Partium* has been so classed, but more Physiology. distinctly so is the treatise *περὶ κρᾶσεων*, *De Temperamentis*, which expounds the doctrine of 'temperaments' or mixtures of the humours and elementary qualities supposed to cause individual peculiarities. From this doctrine has proceeded the whole class of words relating to 'humour', 'temper', good or bad, and so on. This treatise was translated into Latin by Linacre (1521). His other treatises are entitled *περὶ δυνάμεων φυσικῶν*, *De Facultatibus Naturalibus*; *περὶ χρείας ἀναπνοῆς*, *De Usu Respirationis*, etc.

Galen's physiology is more important than his anatomy, and not only so for his results, but for his admirable scientific method. He brought everything to the test of experiment, and though we cannot say positively that no one before him had made experiments on animals, he is historically the founder of Experimental Physiology. His methods of experiment and reasoning were quite in agreement with those of modern times. In his controversies with the Peripatetics and Stoics, who defended the crude physiology of Aristotle and added strange theories of their own, he appealed to the test of dissection and experiment. When, for instance, Chrysippus asserted that the voice came from the heart, Galen challenged any sincere lover of truth to witness the vivisections in which he demonstrated the mechanism of the voice and its connexion with the larynx and with certain nerves, so that if these were cut, the power of producing the voice was abolished. His antagonists, apparently, did not accept the challenge; their methods of argument, he says, consisted in simple assertion. The Peripatetics, indeed, knew how to reason, though they declined to dissect, but the Stoics were totally ignorant of the true methods of reasoning in science. He has a fine passage about the long and arduous way (of experiment) which alone leads to truth, while the short and easy way (of assertion) fails to attain it. (*De Dogmatis Hippocratis et Platonis*, ii 4; v 233, Kühn.) These references are sufficient to show how thoroughly scientific, in the modern sense, were

<sup>1</sup> ed. Helmreich, Teubner, Leipzig.

Galen's methods. The fact that he failed to solve the problem of the circulation, of which Harvey first furnished the solution, has led to an erroneous conception of his scientific accuracy. (This subject is further discussed with quotations in Dr J. F. Payne's *Harveian Oration* for 1896.)

(2) The most important of his works on Dietetics and Hygiene is *ὑγιεινὰ, De Sanitate Tuenda*, a long treatise translated by Linacre (1517). It gives an excellent summary of the Science and Art of personal Hygiene, which the Greeks had brought to a high degree of perfection. Galen lays much stress on bodily exercise, but in a small tract *πότερον λατρικῆς ἢ γυμναστικῆς ἐστὶ τὸ ὑγιεινόν*; 'Does the Art of Health belong to Medicine or to Gymnastics?', he claims that gymnastics should be regulated by medical knowledge, and strongly denounces the so-called *γυμναστική* of the athletes as *κακοτεχνία*, agreeing with Plato that it is injurious rather than beneficial in ordinary life.

(3) *Pathology, or the Science of Disease*. This subject is closely interwoven with all Galen's medical writings, but among special works may be mentioned Pathology. *περὶ ἀνωμάλου δυσκράσιος, De inaequali intemperie*, on the disturbance of humours which constitutes disease, a short treatise often appended to the *De Temperamentis*, of which it is the complement. The titles of some other works; e.g., *περὶ δυσπνοίας*, on difficulty of breathing; *περὶ πλήθους, De Plenitudine*, on Plethora; *περὶ τῶν παρὰ φύσιν ὄγκων, De Tumoribus praeter Naturam*, on Morbid Tumours, etc., explain their contents.

(4) *Works on Diagnosis and Semeiology*. As the Greek physicians had no knowledge of the actual condition of diseased organs, and lacked the precise methods of modern physicians in ascertaining the nature of the disease, they had to make their diagnosis entirely by symptoms, which they studied with wonderful minuteness. Four of Galen's treatises (perhaps meant to be parts of one work) are devoted to a comparison of the differences and causes of disease with the differences and causes of symptoms:—(1) *περὶ διαφορᾶς νοσημάτων*, (2) *περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς νοσημασίν αἰτίων*, (3) *περὶ συμπτωμάτων διαφορᾶς*, (4) *περὶ αἰτίων συμπτωμάτων*. Galen wrote at least six treatises on the Pulse, in which its varieties are analysed with extraordinary complexity. They have been highly praised by eminent modern physicians. The most important work of this class has a somewhat different aim: viz. *περὶ τῶν πεπονθότων τόπων, De Locis Affectis*, which Haller (with whom the present writer respectfully agrees) thought the best of all Galen's medical works, having been written in his old age, and expressing his most mature judgement. He here takes the various organs of the body *seriatim*, and shows by what signs and symptoms their morbid conditions may be detected. Had he had opportunities of confirming his diagnosis by post-mortem examinations, he might have made some approach to modern pathology. Even as it is, this treatise is more congruous with modern medicine than any other of his writings. There is a good French translation by Daremberg (*Oeuvres de Galien*, Paris, 1854, Tome II).

(5) *Works on Pharmacy and Materia Medica*. In this class Greenhill places sixteen works, nine of which are spurious. These are, generally speaking, regarded as compilations from earlier writers, and show no great originality. The most characteristic is *περὶ κράσεως καὶ δυνάμεως τῶν ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων, De temperamentis et facultatibus simplicium medicamentorum*. In this work he classifies medicines according to their possession (in various proportions) of the four elementary qualities of Heat, Cold, Moisture, and Dryness, often inferred on very slender grounds. Since diseases were thought to be produced by an injurious predominance of one or more of these qualities in the humours, the application was obvious; e.g. for hot diseases, cold remedies and so forth, a principle which governed the selection of remedies for many centuries. The term 'cooling medicine' still survives.

(6) *Therapeutics, including Surgery*. The most important work is *θεραπευτικὴ μέθοδος, Methodus Medendi*, one of Galen's longest treatises. Though known in the Middle Ages through faulty Latin versions made from the Arabic, it was first rendered by Linacre into pure and intelligible Latin

(1519). Its aim was to set forth a general systematic method of treating disease; and in this scheme Galen compares himself to Trajan, who, by improving the roads through Italy, had made communication and government easier; even so, he had helped his disciples to find their way through the tangled maze of medicine (ix 8; Kühn, x 633). We here seem to recognise an idea not altogether Greek, but partaking of the organising and governing faculty of the rulers of the Roman Empire. The author succeeded so far as to become, whether he meant it or not, the Dictator of the medical world for centuries; but he showed also that the formal completeness of a system may be rather a hindrance than a help to progress.

A smaller work, *τέχνη λατρική*, *Ars Parua*, known in the Middle Ages through a version made from the Arabic, as *Microtechni*, *Microtegni*, or *Liber Tegni*, was the favourite manual of the mediæval physician. It deals with general principles rather than with details. To give any general idea of Galen's therapeutic methods is impossible. He also wrote on Surgery, but in this subject he acquired less fame than in Medicine, and, after his first visit to Rome, seems to have left the practice of the art to the contemporary Greek surgeons. The advanced state of (Greek?) surgery at Rome is shown by the rich collections of surgical instruments found at Pompeii and Herculaneum.

(7) *Commentaries on Hippocrates*. Galen wrote valuable commentaries on several works of Hippocrates, some of which are useful in establishing the text, as well as in elucidating the subject-matter. That on the Aphorisms extends to seven books. He also composed some tracts in defence of the Master's doctrines.

On  
Hippocrates.

(8) Galen wrote various treatises, chiefly polemical, on the philosophical sects of the Greeks, several of which are extant. Perhaps the most important is that 'On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato', already referred to. It is directed chiefly against Chrysippus and the Stoics, while it includes a severe criticism of the Peripatetics. He was also a copious writer on Logic, about thirty treatises on this subject being attributed to him, of which only two survive:—*περὶ τῶν παρὰ τὴν λέξιν σοφισμάτων*, *De Sophismatis penes Dictionem* (Kühn, xiv 582) and *εἰσαγωγή διαλεκτική*, *Institutio Logica*. He is further credited with the invention of the fourth figure of the syllogism. He refers to a work, the loss of which is much to be regretted, on scientific reasoning, *περὶ ἀποδείξεως*. A skilful reconstruction of the fragments has been made by Iwan von Müller (*Ueber Galen's Werk vom Wissenschaftlichen Beweis*, München, 1895).

Philosophical  
and Logical  
works.

1084. The wonderful extent and variety of Galen's knowledge mark him out as one of the most accomplished and versatile scientific writers that ever lived, but not one of the most original. His style is extremely prolix, and sometimes obscure. The general impression derived from his writings is that his character was honest and truthful, but marred by egotism and self-sufficiency. He was liable to be led away from the path of simple observation by his love of theory and classification. In Philosophy he was broadly a follower of Aristotle, but differed much from the Peripatetics of his own time. In religion he was a pious monotheist, seldom mentioning the Olympian deities, and if at all, chiefly as illustrations of mythology. There are two passages in which he refers critically to Christian beliefs. (*De Usu Partium*, xi 14, iii 905 Kühn; *De Differentiis Pulsuum*, ii 4; viii 579 Kühn.) His great aim in Medicine was to unite the conflicting sects and divergent streams of doctrine, and to frame a synthesis which should combine his own results with those of his predecessors. He succeeded so far that Greek medicine in Galen reached its highest point, when it seemed to lose the power of growth and began to decline. Galen's reputation seems to have been higher in the next generation than in his lifetime; as may be gathered from such writers as Alexander Aphrodisiensis, Athenæus, and Eusebius. No Greek physician is so much quoted by Christian writers. In the Latin world he cannot be said to have founded a school; his works were not translated into Latin in classical times, and, in the eleventh century, Constantinus Africanus says that none existed in that language. Galen's true successors were the Greek physicians of the Byzantine school, who did little

Summary.

else than copy and comment upon his works. He acquired a like predominance among the Arabians, who possessed his works in Arabic translations. From these Arabic translations were made the Latin versions used in the Middle Ages; and by this circuitous route did Galen come back to Western Europe. With few exceptions his writings were not rendered direct from Greek into Latin till the epoch of the Renaissance, when they procured him a still higher, though transient, renown.

1085. Galen's extant writings are very numerous, and it is known that many have been lost; the total number has been estimated at five hundred or more. The best lists are (1) Ackermann's 'Historia Literaria Cl. Galeni' in Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, ed. Harles, vol. v, reprinted in the first volume of Kühn's edition of Galen, 1821; this enumerates the Greek editions and translations; (2) Choulant's, in *Bücherkunde für die ältere Medicin*, 1841, is less complete as regards translations; (3) Greenhill's, in Smith's *Classical Dictionary*, vol. ii, 1846 etc.; (4) the most recent, that of Ilberg, reproduced by Fuchs, in Neuburger and Pagel's *Geschichte der Medizin*, Jena, 1902, vol. i, 381. A catalogue of the MSS of Galen in European libraries has been published in the *Abhandlungen* of the Berlin Academy, 1905; and a complete edition of the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum*, which is to extend to 32 volumes, has been begun under the auspices of the Academies of Berlin, Copenhagen, and Leipzig. Of the works enumerated some are certainly spurious, some doubtful. Choulant gives 181 titles, of which 98 are genuine, 19 fragmentary, 45 spurious and 19 doubtful. Greenhill enumerates 130 medical works, and 19 philosophical. Ilberg's list mentions 104 medical works.

There have been four editions of Galen in the Greek: (1) The Aldine, in five volumes folio, Venice, 1525; (2) Basel, 1538, five vols. folio; (3) ed. Charterius (R. Chartier), in Greek and Latin, along with Hippocrates, 13 vols. large folio, Paris, 1639-79, very complete but inconvenient from its size; (4) ed. C. G. Kühn, Greek and Latin, 20 vols. (in 22) 8vo Leipzig, 1821-33; vol. i contains Ackermann's *Historia Literaria*; the last vol. a full index. This is, at present, the only convenient edition. There are several Latin editions in folio. The *Epitome Galeni Operum* by A. Lacuna is useful. Some of Galen's smaller works have been edited by Marquardt, Iwan von Müller, and Helmreich, *Galenii scripta minora*, 3 vols. Teubner, Leipzig. There is a French transl. of some of the works by Daremberg, *Oeuvres Anatomiques, Physiologiques et Médicales de Galien*, 2 vols. Paris, 1854. See also Ilberg, *Aus Galen's Praxis, ein Kulturbild aus der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, in *Neue Jahrbücher f. d. Class. Alterthum* etc. xv 276-312 (also separately, Leipzig, 1905).

1086. Some writers of inferior importance may be briefly mentioned:—

(1) *Scribonius Largus* lived, as appears from his writings, in the reigns of Tiberius and Claudius, and accompanied the latter emperor on his expedition to Britain, A.D. 43. He is thought to have been a Greek freedman, with a Latin name. He has left a short treatise, *De compositione Medicamentorum*, a collection of medical receipts, arranged according to their uses, derived chiefly from the Greek. It shows a high ideal of medical conduct, and, at the same time, great familiarity with personages of the imperial court. The work has been often printed. (2) *Niger*, or *Sextius Niger*, a Greek, wrote about A.D. 50 in his own tongue a noted work on 'Simple Medicines', now lost. Galen speaks of him as only second to Dioscorides, and Pliny praises him highly. (3) *Dioscorides*, the great Greek botanist, a contemporary of Pliny, inventor of the name and founder of the science of *Materia Medica* (*ὅλη ἱατρική*), has a place in Roman medicine, since his knowledge of plants was gained during his service as a Roman army-physician. The Vienna MS of his work, with all the illustrations, has been published in facsimile (1906). (4) *Marcellus Empiricus*, a layman, compiled probably at the end of the fourth century a treatise *De Medicamentis*, containing some classical medicine, mingled with Roman and Celtic folklore and oriental magic. This compendium is more Roman than Greek, and, worthless though it is, became very popular, and still possesses historical interest. (5) *Caelius Aurelianus*, a physician living at Rome in the beginning of the fifth century, the most

Literary  
History and  
Bibliography.

Other  
medical  
writers  
in Rome.



important Latin medical writer next to Celsus, wrote *De Morbis Acutis et Chronicis*, a work which is essentially a translation from Soranus, a physician of the Methodic school. The book is historically important as an example of the doctrines of this school. Three of the works of Soranus are still extant in the original Greek, and have been published by Ideler, *Med. min.* i 248—260, and Val. Rose, 1882. (6) *Cassius Felix* wrote, A.D. 447, a short treatise *De Medicina, ex Graecis Logicae Sectae auctoribus liber translatus* (ed. Val. Rose, 1879), which is useful for explaining the meaning of some Greek medical terms.

1087. Pliny's famous saying quoted above (§ 1073) seems to mean merely that there was no regular medical profession at Rome before the introduction of the Greek physicians. But no obstacles were placed in the way of the foreigners, since there were never any laws at Rome regulating the practice of medicine, or forbidding anyone (whether qualified or not) to undertake it. Hence the social status of physicians was very various. Men like Asclēpiādēs and Galen consorted with the highest personages, and there must have been many physicians in a middle status corresponding to that of professional men at the present day, but, at the other end of the scale, were drug-sellers, herbalists, bandagists, and rubbers, who bordered closely on simple craftsmen, though all were called *mēdici*. Many skilful physicians were slaves, but the profession was not generally servile, as has been asserted. Iulius Caesar conferred citizenship on Greek physicians, and Augustus granted them immunity from civic duties. Young slaves were sometimes educated as physicians, and such had a high pecuniary value, being taxed at sixty *solidi* in the code of Justinian. They served as domestic physicians, but the master, unless himself a physician, could not make a profit out of their services. Some became freedmen, and this class must have been large, as we find many physicians of Greek birth with Roman names. Few Quirites entered the profession (Plin. xxxix 8), which was therefore mainly Greek, though Celsus (v 22) speaks of some Jewish physicians. Many of them had offices (*tabernae medicae* or *medicinae*) like the Greek *ιατρεία*, which served as surgeries or consulting-rooms, and sometimes, temporarily, as private hospitals. These graded off into the shops of druggists, sellers of ointments, etc. (*pharmācōpōlae*, *unguentārii*, *arōmātārii*). Some cities established public *ιατρεία*, like those of the Greeks. The physicians, like other crafts, formed *Collēgia* or guilds (§ 559 f), and had their regular places of meeting, *Schōlae Medicorum*, but these were not places of instruction.

The medical  
profession.

1088. Neither law nor custom seems to have regulated the fee which a physician might ask or ought to receive. Fashionable doctors were lavishly remunerated by the wealthy Romans. Galen received 400 *solidi* for attending the wife of a consul. Pliny mentions still higher fees. Charnes, a physician of Marseilles, received 200,000 sesterces for visiting a patient at a distance. The ordinary salary of the emperor's physician was 300,000 sesterces, but Stertinus Xenophon demanded of Claudius double this sum, as the equivalent of his private practice. He and his brother (also a physician) left six million sesterces,

Emoluments  
of physicians.

though they had spent vast sums in their lifetime in beautifying Naples. Crinas, of Marseilles, also a munificent public benefactor to his native city, left ten millions. A passage in Plautus (*Aul.* 448 'nummo sum conductus; plus iam medico mercedist opus') vaguely suggests that an ordinary doctor's fee in Rome might be not more than one *nummus* (in Plautus, often a Greek coin equivalent to two *drachmae*, or two francs).

There is no evidence of any regular medical education in republican or early imperial times; though medicine may have been taught in the *Gymnasium* of Nero, or the *Athenæum* of Trajan, as well as in the celebrated schools of Marseilles and Bordeaux, where some eminent physicians received their 'éducation'. But perhaps this only referred to literary training. Alexander Sœuerus was the first to assign public lecture-rooms and salaries to medical professors. The usual method of teaching was individual. Physicians took pupils who paid them fees, and taught them either in their *tabernae* or by taking them round on their visits to private patients, as is known by allusions in Galen's works, and by a well-known epigram of Martial (v 9). There were no hospitals for clinical instruction, in the modern sense; no course of study was prescribed, nor any special ceremony, by which the student became a doctor. In fact, no kind of education was compulsory.

The meaning of the term *archiātri* has been disputed. Some understand it to mean physician to the ruler, or emperor, but it was used in Greek cities where there was no emperor. Others more correctly, it seems, interpret it as chief physician; either as a title or as an office, but it had different meanings at different times. The first at Rome was C. Stertinius Xenophon<sup>1</sup>, physician to Claudius, the next Andrōmāchus, physician to Nero, who is mentioned by Galen. Galen (xiv 2, 4 and 211, Kühn) names two other *Archiatri* of his own time, Magnus and Dēmētrius, evidently meaning a title rather than an office. In the fourth and fifth centuries, we find two orders, *Archiatri populares* and *Archiatri palatini*. The former were medical officers of towns, or districts of Rome, paid by the municipality to treat the poor. They formed a *Collegium*, into which new members were coopted (after examination or other test of their qualifications), and enjoyed important privileges and immunities. The name first appears in an edict of Valentinian I and Valens, A.D. 368, but the office must have existed before. The *Archiatri palatini* or *sacri palatii* were of higher rank, being the personal physicians of the emperor. Under Alexander Seuerus, who regulated their *status*, they were seven in number; one, well salaried, being the 'Physician in Ordinary', the others more or less titular. The position and duties of these two orders are laid down in the Codes of Theodosius and Justinian. The titles are found in numerous inscriptions. Under

<sup>1</sup> Called Stertinius by Pliny (xxix 5), Xenophon by Tacitus (*Ann.* xii 61, 67). An inscription at Cos gives both names, and calls him Physician to Claudius, and 'Archiatr of the divine Augusti'.

Theodosius there was a *Comes Archiattrorum*, but the *Archiater* was generally no more than the local medical officer of modern times. It was the higher order which left to modern Europe the title of *Archiater* assumed by Pontifical, Imperial or Royal physicians.

1089. Even as early as the Punic Wars, we find a physician mentioned at the battle of the Lake Trasymene, and Livy alludes in various places to the care of wounded soldiers, without describing the organisation. The younger Cato, Vibius Pansa and probably other Roman generals took Greek physicians on their campaigns, but perhaps only as their private attendants. Tiberius, on his Illyrian campaign, is said to have provided a large medical staff for the army; but this was perhaps something exceptional. Galen speaks of the army doctors who accompanied M. Antoninus in the German Wars, and, in another place, quotes an eminent military physician Antigonos. But the most important information is derived from numerous inscriptions found in various parts of Europe, including Britain. In the time of Trajan and probably earlier there was a regular organisation. The troops stationed in Rome, the *Vigiles* and *Cohortes urbanae*, had four physicians allotted to each cohort. The legionaries had *medici legionum*, but how many were allotted to each legion is not known. The troops of the allies, as inscriptions show, had medical officers, *medici ordinarii*, and so had the soldiers in the fleet. The work of Hyginus, *De munitionibus castrorum*, describes military hospitals, or *Văletudinaria*, to which special medical officers were assigned. All military medical officers were Roman citizens and had the rank of *principales* with immunity from civic duties. It seems that ophthalmic surgery was an important part of military medicine, since the *seals* of Roman oculists, attached to boxes of ointment and the like, have often been found in France, Britain and Germany, in connexion with military camps; but rarely or never in Italy (§ 1116 *infra*).

Military  
Medicine.

Beverovicus, *Idea Medicinæ Veterum*, Lugd. Bat. 1637 (a remarkable and valuable collection of extracts on Medicine, from non-medical writers). Haeser, *Geschichte der Medicin*, ed. 3, Jena, 1875, vol. i. Puschnann, *History of Medical Education*, Eng. transl. by E. H. Hare, 1891. Withington, E. T., *Medical History from the Earliest Times*, The Scientific Press, 1894. Daremberg, C., *Histoire des Sciences Médicales*, Tome i, 1870. Albert, Maurice, *Les Médecins Grecs à Rome*, Paris, 1894. Greenhill, W. A., articles in Smith's *Dictionaries of Greek and Roman Biography* and *Antiquities* (excellent). Neuburger und Pagel, *Handbuch der Geschichte der Medizin*, Jena, 1902, Band i. Milne, John Stewart, *Surgical Instruments in Greek and Roman Times*, Oxford, 1907. Heiberg, in Gercke and Nørdens *Einleitung*, ii (1910) 423 (see foot of p. 714 *supra*). Allbutt, Sir Clifford, *Lectures on Greek Medicine in Rome*, in *The Lancet* (and *The British Medical Journal*), 20 and 27 Nov. 1909, and 5 and 12 Nov. 1910.

Bibliography.

## IX. EPIGRAPHY, PALAEOGRAPHY, TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

### IX. I. EPIGRAPHY.

**1090.** EPIGRAPHY is the science of inscriptions, and is, strictly speaking, a branch of Palaeography. Latin Epigraphy may be defined as the science concerned with all the remains of the Latin language inscribed on durable materials, such as stone or metal, while Latin Palaeography, is, in practice, confined to that which is written on less durable materials, such as papyrus, parchment, or paper. Writings on wax tablets are sometimes treated as belonging to the domain of Epigraphy, but they are more closely connected with that of Palaeography<sup>1</sup>. The province of Epigraphy is, in one respect, wider than that of Palaeography, for, while Palaeography confines itself to the study of the forms of writing found in ancient manuscripts, Epigraphy deals, not only with the lettering, but also with the subject-matter of ancient inscriptions, thus encroaching on the province of Public and Private Antiquities. Inscriptions on coins are a part of Epigraphy, but they are generally reserved for the domain of Numismatics.

**1091.** All the Italian alphabets, whether Etruscan, Umbrian, Oscan, Faliscan, or Latin, were derived from the alphabet of the Dorian Greeks of Italy and Sicily. This Greek alphabet belonged to the western colonies of the Euboean city of Chalcis, viz. Cumae, Neapolis and Rhegium in Italy, and Zankle, Naxos and Himera in Sicily. The forms of the Greek letters are preserved on coins and in inscriptions and syllabaries. The ordinary types of these letters are as follows:—

Α	Β	Γ	Δ	Ε	Ζ	Η	Θ	Ι	Κ	Λ	Μ	Ν	Ο	Π	Ρ	Σ	Τ	Υ	Χ	Φ	Ψ
<i>α</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>γ</i>	<i>δ</i>	<i>ε</i>	<i>ζ</i>	<i>η</i>	<i>θ</i>	<i>ι</i>	<i>κ</i>	<i>λ</i>	<i>μ</i>	<i>ν</i>	<i>ο</i>	<i>π</i>	<i>ρ</i>	<i>σ</i>	<i>τ</i>	<i>υ</i>	<i>ξ</i>	<i>φ</i>	<i>χ</i>

The variants found in Chalcidic texts may here be added:—

Α	Α	(not Α),	ν	Δ,	&	£,	Β,	⊗	⊙	⊙,	Μ,	Π,	Ρ	Ρ,	ξ	Ζ,	Υ,	+	Υ	Υ
<i>α</i>			<i>δ</i>	<i>ε</i>	<i>ζ</i>	<i>η</i>		<i>θ</i>		<i>μ</i>	<i>π</i>	<i>ρ</i>	<i>σ</i>	<i>υ</i>	<i>ξ</i>	<i>χ</i>				

<sup>1</sup> See §§ 1138–9 *infra*.



The following is the Greek Alphabet on the Formello vase found near Veii. It may be regarded as a link between the Chalcidian and the Italic alphabets. The letters corresponding to  $\epsilon$  and  $\Phi$  are accidentally transposed in the original, but the order is corrected in the almost identical second alphabet on the same vase (cp. E. S. Roberts, *Greek Epigraphy*, i p. 17).




Fig. 105. Greek alphabet on the Formello vase.

It will be observed that this alphabet closely coincides with that used on the archaic *cippus* in the Roman Forum (§ 1092).

In early Latin the symbol for  $\zeta$  soon fell out of use. The Romans also rejected the three Greek aspirates  $\Theta$   $\Phi$   $\Psi$  as letters of the alphabet, but adopted them as numerals (§ 1097).  $\zeta$ , the curved form of the old Greek *gamma*, had, at first, the same value as *gamma*, but it was also used to express the sound of *kappa*. Thus the symbol  $\zeta$  did double duty for the sounds of  $\kappa$  and  $\gamma$ . To prevent confusion, the symbol  $\zeta$ , when used to represent the sound of *gamma*, was slightly changed into  $\gamma$ .  $\gamma$  is first found on an *as libralis* of Luceria, before 269 B.C. (Mommsen, *Unt. Dial.* 32), and a distinction between  $\zeta$  and  $\gamma$  ( $\zeta$  and  $\gamma$ ) may be noticed about 250 B.C. on the earliest coins of Aesernia, and in the Oscan bronze of Rapino (Conway, *Italic Dialects*, i 254). About 234 the grammarian Spurius Caruilius appears to have been the first to give the letter  $\gamma$  its present position in the place formerly held by  $\zeta$  in the Greek alphabet (cp. Plut. *Q. R.* 54). In the *elogium* on Scipio Barbatus, probably later than 234, we find the letter  $\gamma$  in *Gnainod*, *prognatus* and *subigit* (Fig. 111 b). During the time when  $\zeta$  was still used for  $\gamma$ , the abbreviations  $\zeta$  and  $\zeta\gamma$  stood for the *praenomina* pronounced as Gaius and Gnaeus, and the old spelling of these abbreviations was retained after the introduction of the new letter,  $\gamma$ .

After the rejection of the three aspirates and the introduction of  $\gamma$ , the Latin alphabet consisted of the following 21 letters. That number is mentioned by Cicero (*N. D.* ii 93), and  $\chi$  is called the last letter by Quintilian (i 4, 9).

A B C D E F G H I K L M N O P Q R S T V X

Late in the seventh century of Rome,  $\psi$  and  $\omega$  were introduced in the spelling of words borrowed from the Greek, such as ZEPHYRVS. The

Greek Y had previously been represented by V or I. Thus Ennius wrote **BVRRVS** for *Πύρρος* and **BRVGES** for *Φρύγες*. Only a single example of Y has been found in Latin before the seventh century, **DIONYSI** on an inscription from Puteoli (*P. L. M. E.* 76; *C. I. L.* x 3975). Z, which had been found in the *Carmen Saliorum* (Varro, *L. L.* vii 26), and on a coin of Cosa later than 273 B.C., was revived in the age of Sulla. The Greek Z had been previously expressed in Latin by S at the beginning and SS in the middle of a word, e.g. *sona* (ζώνη) and *tarpeſsita* (τραπεζίτης).

Three new letters were invented by the emperor Claudius (Tac. *Ann.* xiv 14), who used an inverted *digamma* **Ƀ** for the consonant or semivowel V, an *antisigma* **Ϸ** for the combination *bs* or *ps*, and **Ɂ** (the first half of the aspirate H) for a sound between *i* and *u* in words like *optumus* and *maxumus*. The first and the third of these symbols are actually found in inscriptions of the time of Claudius to express the Latin V (as in Fig. 117), and the Greek Y, as in **AEGɃPTI** and **BɃBLIOTHECA**.

**Double consonants** are said to have been introduced by Ennius (d. 169 B.C.). The earliest known example is in a decree of 189 B.C., where *possidere* occurs by the side of *posedisent* (Fig. 123). They are also found c. 150 and become common before 100 B.C.

**Double vowels** were introduced by Accius (fl. 139 B.C.) to represent a long vowel. In Latin this doubling is confined to the vowels A, E, U, e.g. *Vaurus* and *seedes* in the Aletrium inscription (*C. I. L.* i 1166; Lindsay, p. 83), and *Iuulius*. The earliest example is *paastores* in 132 B.C. (Fig. 122). The double vowels, as well as the form *qura* and the shape of the letters, have led to the following epitaph from the *Via Appia* being assigned to the age of Accius:—

Hoc est factum monumentum | Maarco Caicilio.  
Hospes, gratum est quom apud | meas restitistei seedes;  
bene rem geras et ualeas, | dormias sine qura.

Dessau, ii 876; *P. L. M. E.* tab. 69 D.

This usage is found in inscriptions from the time of the Gracchi (133 B.C.) to the Mithradatic war (75 B.C.). From that date to the second half of the third century the long vowel was distinguished by an *apex* ('); cp. Fig. 116.


**An Archaic Alphabet** was used in ancient treaties, such as that with Gabii (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* iv 58), and with the Latins (*ib.* iv 26) and the Carthaginians (Polyb. iii 22). The first of these was written on an ox-hide; and the other two engraved on bronze.

On the Latin Alphabet, cp. *Index Palaeographicus* to Ritschl's *P. L. M. E.* (1862), and article of 1869, reprinted in his *Opusc.* iv 691—726; Kirchhoff's *Studien* (1863; ed. 4, 1887); Isaac Taylor, *The Alphabet*, 1883, ii 124—144; Hübner's *Exempla* (1885) liii—lvii; Lindsay's *Latin Language*, 1—12; and Giles' *Manual of Comparative Philology*, §§ 606—9.

The earliest Latin inscription in metal is that on the gold fibula of Praeneste, where all the letters are Greek in form. The retrograde

order, the use of FH for F, FHEFHAKED for *fecit* and NVMASIOI for *Numerio*, all point to a very early date (cp. Bücheler in *Rhein. Mus.* xlii 317; Darbishire, *Reliquiae Philologicae*, 6—14). This inscription is assigned to the sixth century B.C.

Earliest Latin  
inscriptions.  
Fibula  
Praenestina.



lolsA W W W : d 1 k A ' B 1 : e B 1 : d 3 W W : s o l W A W W


*manios · med · fhe · fhaked · numasioi*

Fig. 106. Fibula Praenestina (*C. I. L.* xiv 4123; slightly reduced from *Röm. Mitth.* 1887, p. 37). The points are more correctly copied in the transcript below the cut.

1092. The earliest Latin inscription carved in stone is that on the four sides of a rectangular pillar, or *cippus*, of tufa lying five feet below the pavement of black marble found in 1899 between the Forum and the Comitium. The letters run in lines vertical to the base; the first line is written from below upward, the second from above downward, and so on, alternately. This inscription is not later than the fifth century B.C., and the letters show a very close resemblance to those of the Greek alphabet, and especially to those on the Formello vase (Fig. 105). We here have C for G, B for H, P for R, Q for Q, S for S, Y for V; the words are separated by three vertical points. Cp. the above *fibula*. Mention is made of the *kalator*, and the *rex* (possibly the *rex sacrorum*) in the form *recei* (for *regi*), and of *iouxmenta* (for *iumenta*).

The Forum  
inscription.

Cp. Comparetti, *Iscrizione archaica del Foro Romano*, Firenze, 1900, whose copy of the inscription is here reproduced on a smaller scale; Hulsen, *Roman Forum*, 1909<sup>2</sup>, p. 105 f; E. C. Clark, *Proc. of Soc. Antiq.*, 20 June, 1901; Minton Warren, in *A. J. P.* xxviii (1907), 249 f, 373 f; further literature in Dessau, ii 248, and in Egbert, p. 476, ed. 1908, where Vasari's photograph is reproduced; Giles' *Manual*, ed. 1901, § 666, with facsimile from the official *Notizie*; Bursian's *Jahresberichi*, cxxvii (1905) 257—280, cxliv (1909) 162 f. Cast in Cambridge Museum of Classical Archaeology; also in the Museums of Harvard and Johns Hopkins Universities.



16. ..OIVOVIOD
1. QVOI HOI.....
2. SAKPOS ES-
3. ED SOR....
4. ....IA..IAS
5. RECEI.L....
6. ....EVAM
7. QVOS.R....
8. M.KALATO-
- 9 REM.HAP....
10. ...IOD IOVXMEN-
11. TA.KAPIA.DOTAV..
12. M ITE.RI....
13. ...M.QVOI HA
14. VELOD.NEQV....
15. ....OD.IOVESTOD

Lines 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 run from right to left; 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, from left to right; 8, 9, 16 are upside down. (1) HOI may be HON<sup>ce</sup>; (2-3) SAKPOS ESED=*sacer sit.* (5) RECEI=*regi.* (6) EVAM=*devam* for *deivam.* (10-11) IOVXMENTA=*iumenta.* Thurneysen inverts the order of the last four lines; the inscr. ends with (16) added in smaller letters along the edge of the stone, between the fourth face and the first.

Fig. 107. Inscription on the archaic cippus in the Forum (170).



1093. Greek influence is clearly visible in the 'Duenos' inscription, which runs round the outer edge of three small vases, joined together in an equilateral triangle, found near the Quirinal in 1880. The inscription is assigned to the early part of the fourth century.

The 'Duenos' inscription.




Fig. 108. The 'Duenos' Inscription (slightly reduced from Dressel, *Annali*, pl. 1, 1880; *C. I. L.* i p. 371<sup>2</sup>; Dessau, ii 986).

*Ioue sat deiuos qoi med mitat nei ted endo cosmis uirco sied  
asted noisi ope toitesiai pakari uois  
Duenos med jeced en manom einom dzenoine med mano statod.*

Ioui Saturno deis qui me mittat, ne te intus comes uirgo sit | adstet, nisi Opi Tutesiae pacari uis; | Duenos me fecit propter mortuum ut die noni me mano sistito (Bücheler, *Rhein. Mus.* xxxvi 255).

Prof. Conway, reading *Io. Vei. Sat.*, *Duenoi ne med*, and *malo* (for *mano*) translates:— 'May the gods Jove, Vejove, Saturn (grant) that Proserpine, to whom they suffer this vase to be despatched, show thee no favour. Unless thou, indeed, art willing to make thy peace with Ops Toitesia. Duenos made me (as a curse) against Manos, and let no evil fall to Duenos from me' (*A. J. P.* x 445—459). See also Thurneysen in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, xxxiii, and E. W. Fay in *A. J. P.* xxx (1909) 121—138. Cp. Lindsay's *Handbook*, pp. 19—23, and Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, cvi (1901) 40—46.

Here we have A A A for A; ɔ for C and G; d and ɔ for D; W for M; O and O for O; p for P; q for Qu; r for R; S and Z for S. As in the other early inscriptions, the letters closely resemble those of the



(a) The original epitaph written in red; (b) the elogium, in Saturnian metre, incised on the stone; (c) the epitaph of Cornelia, wife of Hispallus, consul of 176 B.C.




Fig. 111. Epitaph of Scipio Barbatus (reduced to more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Ritschl, tab. 37). Dessau, i 1. Cp. Lindsay, 41 f.

(a) The epitaph in its present state; (b) the elogium; (c) the epitaph of the wife of Hispallus. (b) is later than (a), and even later than the epitaph of the son of Barbatus, Fig. 112 (Ritschl, *Opusc.* iv 222 f). Wölfflin, *S. Ber. Münch. Akad.* 1892, 188—219, assigns the *elogia* in Figs. 111 ('after 200'), 112 ('c. 200'), 114 (c. 170), to Ennius (*ob.* 169), and that in Fig. 113 (c. 160) to Pacuvius, on grounds regarded as weak by Schanz, *Röm. Lit.* i 50<sup>3</sup>.

(a) *L. Cornelio*] Cn. f. Scipio

(b) Cornelius Lucius Scipio Barbatus,  
Gnaiuod patre | prognatus, fortis uir sapiensque,  
quoius forma uirtutei parisuma | fuit;  
consol, censor, aidilis qui fuit apud uos;  
Taurasia Cisauna | Sannio cepit,  
subigit omne Loucanam opsidisque abducit.

(c) [P]aulla Cornelia Cn. f. Hispalli.




Fig. 112. Epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio (consul 259 B.C.), son of Barbatus (reduced to  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Ritschl, tab. 38). Dessau, i 2. Cp. Lindsay, 39 f.

[L.] Cornelio L. f. Scipio | [a]diles, cosol, cesor.

Honc oino plourume cosentiont R[omaz]  
duonoro optumo fuise uiro,  
Luciom Scipione. Filios Barbati,  
consol, censor, aidilis hic fuet a[pud uos].  
Hec cepit Corsica Aleriaque urbe,  
dedet Tempestatebus aide mereto . . . . .

CORNELIVS CN F CN N S C I P I O M A G N A S A P I E N T I A  
M V L T A S Q V E V I R T A T E S A E T A T E Q V O M P A R V A  
P O S I D E T H O C S A X S U M Q U O I E I U I T A D E F E C I T N O N  
H O N O S H O N O R E I S H I C S I T U S Q V E I N V N Q V A M  
V I C T U S E S T M I N U S S I T M A N D A T U S N E Q V I R A T I S H O N O R E  
C N E I M I N U S S I T M A N D A T U S

Fig. 113. Epitaph of L. Cornelius Scipio (c. 160 B.C.), probably a younger son of Hispallus (consul 176 B.C.), (reduced to more than  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Ritschl, tab. 41). Dessau, i 3. Cp. Lindsay, 76 f.

L. Cornelius Cn. f. Cn. n. Scipio.

Magna sapientia | multasque uirtutes  
aetate quom parua | posidet hoc saxsum.  
Quoiei uita defectit, non | honos, honore.  
Is hic situs, quei nunquam | uictus est uirtutei.  
Annos gnatus XX is | l. . eis<sup>1</sup> mandatus:  
ne quairatis honore | quei minus sit mandatus.

<sup>1</sup> *locis* Mommsen; *diuis* Bücheler.

QVOD PICE IN SIGILLI  
MAORS PERIT  
BREVIA HO  
GLORIA AIT  
IN LONGA LIE  
FACILE FACIE  
MAIORVAM  
ALITO RECH  
PROGNATVA

Fig. 114. Epitaph of P. Cornelius P. f. Scipio, *flamen Dialis*, who died young (probably c. 170 B.C.), possibly a son of Africanus maior (c.  $\frac{1}{4}$  of Ritschl, tab. 39 f). Dessau, i 2.



Quei apice insigne Dial[is M]aminis gesistei, |  
 mors perfe[cit] tua ut essent omnia | breuia,  
 honos fama uirtusque | gloria atque ingenium,  
 quibus sei | in longa licu[et] tibe utier uita |,  
 facile facteis superases gloriam | maiorum.  
 quare lubens te in gremiu, | Scipio, recip[et]  
 terra, Publi, | prognatum Publio, Corneli.

The fully developed alphabet of the *Scriptura monumentalis* belongs to the age of Augustus and the early Empire. The letters are square and exact, the *literae quadratae* or *lapidariae* of Petronius (29, 58), executed by a professional stone-cutter. The subjoined inscription from the tablet on the massive tomb of Caecilia, daughter of Q. Caecilius Metellus Creticus (consul of 69 B.C.), and wife of the son of M. Crassus, belongs to the early part of the Augustan age.

CAECILIAE  
 Q·CRETICI·F  
 METELLAE·CRASSI

Fig. 115. Epitaph of Caecilia Metella on the Via Appia, Rome  
 (Hübner's *Exempla*, no. 61),  $\frac{1}{12}$ .

*Caeciliae | Q. Cretici f(iliae) | Metellae Crassi (C. I. L. vi 1274).*

The following inscription of a still more public character is an excellent example of the best monumental style of the age of Augustus.

IMPCAESAR·DIVI·F  
 AVGVSTVS  
 PONTIFEX·MAXIMVS  
 IMP·XTI·COS·XTI·TRIB·POT·XTV  
 AEGVPTO·IN·POTESTATEM  
 POPVLI·ROMANI·REDACTA  
 SOLI·DÓNVM·DEDIT

Fig. 116. From an obelisk in the Circus Maximus, now in the Piazza del Popolo, Rome, 10 B.C. (reduced by  $\frac{1}{2}$  from Hübner's *Exempla*, no. 52).

1095. In contrast to the carefully outlined and deeply cut lettering of the great public monuments, we have the smaller and simpler type used for inscriptions of a more ordinary kind. This assumed three forms:—

(1) The lettering employed in public documents, *scriptura actuaria*. In early times public announcements or advertisements were painted in

black letters on the walls of buildings. The use of the brush led to the letters assuming a free and flowing form, and this form was partially reproduced even when the document was cut in bronze or stone. As an early example of the documental style in bronze we have the decree of L. Aemilius Paulus, belonging to 189 B.C. (Fig. 123). The *scriptura actuaria* of the Augustan age is exemplified in the marble tablets of the *Acta Triumphorum* (Fig. 126). A later example may be seen in the bronze tablet recording the Oration of Claudius at Lyons (Fig. 124). The 'painted' style is exemplified by the following Pompeian inscription, also belonging to the age of Claudius, as is inferred from its containing two examples of one of the three letters which he added to the Latin alphabet.

SPIVRRANIVSESPNIPRONFAB  
 PROCVIVSGELLIANVS  
 PRAEFABRITPRAIECVRAIORVMALIEL  
 TIBERIS PRAIEPROPRIDINVRBELAJINIO

Fig. 117. From a Pompeian pedestal of black marble, now in the Museum of Naples (Hübner's *Exempla*, no. 135), c.  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

*Sp. Turranius L. f(i)lius Sp. n(epos) L. pron(epos) Fab(ia tribu) | Proculus Gellianus | praef(ectus) fabr(um) II, praif(ectus) curatorum aliei | Tiberis, praif(ectus) pro pr(aetore) i(ure) d(icundo) in urbe La(j)inio, | pater patratus populi Laurentis, ... l(oco) d(alo) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) (C. I. L. x 797). On  $\Delta$  for  $\nabla$  cp. p. 730 *supra*.*

The other two are developments of the *written*, rather than the *epigraphic* style:—

(2) The *cursive* characters, generally confined to wax-tablets, and to the *graffiti* of Pompeii.

<sup>6</sup>  
 ITTETD.THEOPIANISSEMCEPDICTVXN/ALVTEAN  
 NOMNENYNC.DEXTNITEXCV/INOLLNEMANNIC  
<sup>7</sup>  
 VRLA.SIT.OLANTITVLAJANUALLXSEFTTNC.  
 JANDIAT.EXC.LVSIFLDA.PTELTVS  
 JANITORADAMTSSICILIT.FI.ML(XT.MAXI).  
 LUDUSMODUCTAM.SOMNICTVFOVFRAX

Fig. 118. Pompeian graffiti, including two quotations from the poets (*C. I. L.* iv 1891-93-94), more than  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

(6) *Littera Theorianis semper dictura salutem*  
*Nomine nunc Dextri tempus in omne manet.* Anon.

(7) *Surda sit oranti tua ianua laxa ferenti*  
*Audiat exclusi uerba receptus* [am]a[us].  
 Ovid, *Am.* i 8, 77.

*Ianitor ad dantis uigilet, si pulsat inanis*  
*Surdus in obductam somniet usque seram.*  
 Propertius, iv (v) 5, 47.

(3) The **uncial letters** of rounded form and with a marked curve on the vertical strokes, which were borrowed from the written style of papyri and parchments, and adopted in African inscriptions of the end of the third century, and in dedicatory inscriptions elsewhere, from the end of the fourth. In the following example the use of a form of U for V will be noticed in lines 2, 3, 4.




Fig. 119. On a pedestal at Thamugadi (Timgad), N. Africa  
 (Hübner's *Exempla*, no. 1147),  $\frac{1}{3}$ .

*Vocontio | P. F(lauio) Pudenti Pompo|niano c(larissimo u(i)ro), erga | civeis patriamque |*  
*etc. militaribus* (C. I. L. viii 2391).

1096. The shapes of the letters vary according as they are used in the monumental, the documentary, or the cursive style. Thus the horizontal stroke of A is retained in the monumental style (though it varies in height), while it is often omitted in the documentary ( $\wedge$ ), or deflected from the right or the left ( $\Lambda$  or  $\nearrow$ ) or made vertical ( $\Uparrow$ ) in the cursive, which sometimes omits it and prolongs the right arm upwards ( $\lambda$ ). A.

The angular type, B, is found in some early inscriptions, and in letters cut in lead under the Empire, the form depending on the material used. The rounded type is in ordinary use during all periods, with variations in the relative sizes of the two lobes. The lower lobe is rather large in copies of the *Fasti*. Sometimes, in the painted style, the upper lobe entirely vanishes, and the upper part of the stem, or of the lower lobe, is curved upwards. B.

The archaic forms of C are  $\angle$   $\lrcorner$  C. The narrower forms are found in early inscriptions, while the fully rounded form belongs to the best period. In and after that period it is sometimes made larger than the next letter, C.

especially at the beginning of the line, where it may even include the next letter within its curve. Similarly, at the end, we may have a large **C** embracing a small **o**.

The archaic forms of **D** are  $\text{D} \text{ } \text{D} \text{ } \text{D}$ . The fully rounded type is found on monumental

**D.** inscriptions of the best age. In laws of the republican period, inscribed on metal plates, the lobe is often left partly open, either above or below.

In the painted, the documental, and the cursive styles, a tail often extends to the left from the upper part of the lobe.

The archaic forms of **E** are  $\text{E} \text{ } \text{E} \text{ } \text{E}$ . Under the Republic the three parallel lines are sometimes deflected downwards, but in the Augustan age these lines are

**E.** horizontal, and are of very nearly (if not exactly) equal length. After

the Augustan age the central horizontal line becomes shorter. In the painted style, the parallel lines are curved upwards and are sometimes very short, so that the letter **E** resembles the letters **FLIT**. The form  $\text{||}$  probably arose out of the use of  $\text{I}$  for **F**. It is found under the Republic, and in ancient inscriptions of lower Italy, and is not infrequently used under the Empire, especially in the 'vulgar' style.

**F** went through the same changes as **E**. The archaic forms are  $\text{F} \text{ } \text{F} \text{ } \text{F}$ . In the

**F.** monumental style of the best age the two transverse lines are horizontal and equal. They are deflected *upwards* in ancient times, and in the

second and third centuries of the Empire; and also in the painted, and the vulgar styles.

Deflection *downwards*, which is also ancient, is not found under the Empire.  $\text{I}$  is to be seen in the Pompeian *graffiti*. **F** (like **P** and **T**) is often taller than the other letters, especially at the beginning of the line. This fashion dates from the second century in Italy and the provinces, and from after the third in Rome.

In the monumental style of the early Empire the very short stroke distinguishing **G**

**G.** from **C** rises straight upwards and is deflected horizontally towards the left. The form in which the stroke immediately curves inwards is rare

in the first century, but is common in the next two centuries, especially when the letters are small and are in the painted style. **C** and other cursive forms are also found in the uncial style; late in the second century they even appear in some of the smaller examples of the monumental style.

$\text{H}$ , the earliest form of **H**, may be seen in the ancient *cippus* of the Forum (Fig. 107),

and on the *fibula Praenestina* (Fig. 106). **H** varies little. Rather broad

**H.** in the early monumental style, it gradually becomes narrower. Some-

times the transverse stroke either extends beyond the two vertical lines, or joins the lower part of the first to the upper part of the second. The partial or complete omission of the upper part of the second vertical line begins in some Roman inscriptions of the second century. This is an early form of the modern **h**.

In most of the inscriptions of the Republic and early Empire, **I** is perfectly plain, with

**I.** no further strokes, either above or below. These are added, in a straight

or curved form, in inscriptions of the painted style, in which (as in the

vulgar style) it often resembles **T** or **L**. **I** is used for the semivowel, as well as for the vowel.

In Cicero's time the semivowel was sometimes expressed by a double **I**, as in **CVIIVS**,

**EIIVS**, for *cuius, eius*. Cicero himself wrote *aiio* and *Maia* for *aio* and *Maia* (Quint.

i 4, 11), and there is also evidence for *Aiax* and *Troiam*; but this innovation did not

become common. About the time of Sulla a tall **I** was used for *ei*, and this was partly

continued in the Augustan age, especially in the dative and ablative plural. The tall **I** was

also used to denote the long vowel in **DIIVOS** and **DIVI**, in **IVLII** and **CAESARI**, and in

**PRIDIE** and **APRILIS**; as the first letter of **IMPERATOR** (especially at the beginning of

the line); and even in **IN** and **ITEM**, and **IVSSV**, and **ISDEM CONSVLIBVS** (87—

155 A.D.)<sup>1</sup>. Under the Empire,  $\text{I}$  was used between two vowels, as in **CVIVS** and **EIVS**

<sup>1</sup> For **DIVI** cp. Fig. 116, l. 1, and 125, l. 1.



(*C. I. L.* ii 1964 v. 18). For the latter we even find **ELIVS** and **EILVS** (Hübner's *Ex.* 808; *C. I. L.* ii 1687, 1953). The form **J**, which originated in the written style, came into occasional use in the second century. In modern alphabets this form was adopted as an initial letter in the fifteenth century. The dotted **I** appears about 500 A.D.

The letter **K** was seldom used and underwent little change. Under the early Empire the two transverse strokes were very small (Fig. 126). In the painted style they become larger about 300 A.D. **K.**

The archaic form of **L** was **└** (see Fig. 112 *supra*). The most ancient angular type gradually gave way to the various rectangular forms, and completely disappeared about 200 B.C. In the best age the horizontal line measures a little more than half the vertical. In later times it varies and becomes much shorter, sometimes differing but little from **I**. A tall **L** is often found as an initial letter. In the documental and the cursive style, the lower stroke is sometimes curved downwards. **L.**  
**h** is peculiar to the vulgar style.

The oldest form of **M**, which has five straight lines, **𐌢**, is found on the *fibula Praenestina* and in the 'Duenos inscription' (Figs. 106, 108). This form was used as the abbreviation for Manius under the Republic and (occasionally) under the Empire; **M'** (for Manius) is purely modern. The straddling form in four lines (**𐌢**) is the prevailing type (Figs. 112—116). **𐌢** and **𐌢** are very rare under the Republic, the former being found on coins and small articles, and the latter only on coins, to save space. The former is not used in monumental inscriptions till after 200 A.D.; it is about that time the form **M** comes first into use in Germany. **𐌢**, a cursive form of the best age, appears later on monuments of the lower class, while another cursive form **𐌢** is found in the Pompeian *graffiti*. **M.**

The earliest form **N**, in which all the strokes were oblique, was retained under the Republic, but the upright form is sometimes found in the same inscriptions as the other. **N** is the usual type of the best age. Extra touches were gradually added to the top and bottom of the vertical lines. **N.**

The archaic forms of **O** were **○ ○ ( ) < >**. In the earliest times, **O** was often much smaller than the other letters; this was partly continued under the Empire, especially after **C**, which often embraces a small **o** in its curve, as in the abbreviation **Ⓢ** for *consul*. **O.**

The archaic forms of **P** are **┐ P**. The latter remains the standard type. The closed form, **P**, is sometimes found on the *glandes plumbeae* and the *tesserae* of the Republic, but it is rare under the early Empire. It appears about 100 A.D. in Germany, and about 200 A.D. in the other provinces, and in Rome. As an initial letter it is taller than the rest. **P.**

The earliest form of **Q** is **𐌒**. Among other archaic forms are **Q** and **Q**. Under the late Republic, the tail is short and nearly straight, in the early Empire it is longer and more curved (Figs. 124, 125). **Q.**

The oldest form of **R** is found in the retroverted Greek type of the earliest inscriptions (Fig. 108). Among other archaic forms are **𐌶** and **𐌶**. In the standard monumental type of this letter, the circumference of the fully rounded upper loop ends at the middle of the shaft, and it is at this point that the tail begins. **R.**

The archaic forms of **S** are **𐌱 𐌱**. The angular types belong to the age of the Republic alone. The curved form of perfect symmetry is characteristic of the best period. **S.**

The archaic types of **T** are **┐** and **┐** as well as **T**. Under the early Empire this last was the standard form, and it was often made taller to save space on either **T.**

side (Fig. 117). In the documental and cursive styles, the transverse line was slightly curved.

V is fairly constant, but it sometimes slopes to the left, with the right stroke perpendicular and the left stroke slightly lengthened. The same letter was used

V.  
for the vowel and for the semivowel. The curved form U is used for both in the uncial style at Rome about 200 A.D., and later elsewhere (cp. Fig. 119).

In comparatively modern alphabets, V was used in the tenth century as the initial, and U as the medial letter, and V came to be regarded as the semivowel, U as the vowel.

The archaic + is found in an ancient inscription from the *lacus Benacus* (C. I. L.

X. i 1434). The normal character X underwent little change under the Empire.

Y and Z were borrowed, towards the close of the Republic, for the transliteration of Greek words. Y was often made taller than the other letters, and sometimes assumed a slanting form. In other respects Y (like Z) was

Y.  
Z.  
constant in shape.

1097. The original numerals were I (a single digit) for 'one', V (a rudimentary representation of the five fingers) for 'five'; X (or the two hands joined) for 'ten'. X, however, is sometimes regarded as an Etruscan symbol for 'ten', the upper half of which was adopted for 'five'. To these ancient symbols two were added from the Chalcidic alphabets, *ch*, ↓ (altered into ↓, ⊥, ⊥) for 50, and *ph*, ⊕ (⊕, later CIO) for 1000. The sign for 100 (C) probably originated in the Chalcidic ⊙. The opinion that it was the three Chalcidic aspirates that were borrowed to denote 50 and 1000 and 100 is confirmed by the Etruscan alphabet, in which these aspirates, retained as letters, were slightly changed when used as numerals.

While ⊕ denotes 1000, the addition of a second circle outside the first made it mean 10,000, and that of a third, 100,000. Half of these figures was denoted by the second half of the symbol, e.g. D for 500 (cp. Cicero, *pro Q. Roscio*, 4, 11 f, 22 f, 28 f, 32 f, 40 f, 43, 48 f, 55). In early inscriptions, multiples of 100,000 were expressed by repeating the symbol as often as necessary (cp. Fig. 121).

Towards the end of the Republic the thousands were denoted by drawing a horizontal line above the numeral, e.g.  $\overline{V}$  = 5,000,  $\overline{D}$  = 500,000. Lateral lines were further added to denote 100,000, e.g.  $|\overline{X}|$  = 1,000,000. These lines are first found in the *lex Rubria* of 43 B.C. (C. I. L. i 204).

The original numerals I, V, X, being identical with certain letters of the alphabet, other numerals were assimilated to letters. Thus the second half of ⊕ became D, ⊙ became C, and ⊥ became L. The second of these changes was favoured by the fact that C was the first letter of *centum*. At an early date *milie passuum* was represented by M<sup>p</sup>, but the separate use of M for the word *mille* or *milie* is not found before the second century A.D., and M was never used as a mere numeral. The old form ⊕ was sometimes changed into ∞ (Cicero, *pro Q. Roscio*, 28 f) or ∞.

To prevent confusion in the use of the same signs as numerals and as letters, the numerals were distinguished by drawing a horizontal line either across the letter or (in the Augustan age) above. A familiar example of the early use of II as a numeral is to be seen in HS (= *duo + semis*) for *semis-tertius*, the *sestertius* of 2½ *asses*. II, after the title of an office, denotes that it has been twice held. IIIVIR is the common abbreviation for *duumvir*.

Numerals other than those above mentioned were expressed either by the method of addition, in which the higher figure comes first, or by that of subtraction, in which it comes last. Of these methods the former is the earlier, and the more usual. Thus, IIII is earlier and more frequent than IV, while the latter belongs to writing of the lower class and is first found in the seventh century of Rome. VIII is commoner than IIX, and XXVIII

than XXIIIX. Besides I and X, C is used in subtraction, as CDL=450 and C∞LX=960 (Mommsen in *Hermes*, xxii 603).

1098. The single *as* was denoted by I and the *uncia*, its twelfth part, by — or o. The *quadrans* of 3 *unciae* was expressed by =—; the *semis* by its first letter S; Fractions.  
and the *denunc* of 11 *unciae* by S=—<sup>1</sup>.

1099. With a view to saving space, especially at the end of the line, two or three or even more letters are sometimes joined together: e.g. A preceding E, M, Ligatures.  
N, R, TR, V, VR; I preceding B, N, R, T; or following C, F, H, L, M,  
N, P, T, V. This practice first appears on coins about 200 B.C. and in inscriptions about 150. To save space in an inscription of c. 41 A.D., ET is represented by  $\frac{E}{T}$  in the second line, and by a monogram in the third (Hübner, *Ex.* 193). Ligatures were not in general use in Italy, but became common in Gaul, Germany, and Africa. (Lists in Hübner's *Exempla*, p. lxxviii; Cagnat, p. 24; and Egbert, p. 67.)

It is stated by grammarians that a *sicilicus* or laterally inverted C, O, was placed above a consonant which was to be regarded as a doubled letter. Some Sicilicus.  
examples of this (e.g. SABELIO and OSA) belong to the early part of the Augustan age (*C. I. L.* v 1361, x 3743, xii 414).

The *apex* was used to distinguish vowels which were naturally long (Figs. 116, 125). It was in use from after the age of Sulla to about 250 A.D. Its earlier forms were ɔ ɟ ɿ ɿ̇, and, under the Empire, ʹ. It is rarely found over I. Apex.

Long I was written as EI after 134 B.C., or expressed by a taller letter c. 80 B.C. to 150 A.D.

1100. The several words were separated by means of a mark placed, not at the foot of the line of letters, but midway between the top and the bottom. These Punctuation.  
marks are nearly always absent at the ends of the lines, and they are not used to denote the termination of a clause or a sentence. When the letters are in relief this mark is round. When they are incised in stone or metal, it may be either square or oblong or triangular (Fig. 125). This last finally assumed the ornamental form of an ivy-leaf. An inscription at Cirta expressly mentions *hederae distinguentes* (*C. I. L.* viii 6982). Towards the end of the first century the more important divisions are sometimes distinguished by branches of palm. In the more ancient inscriptions (especially in the early *leges* of the Republic) words are seldom divided at the end of the line; but this becomes common in the *acta* of the Empire<sup>2</sup>.

1101. Some of the epitaphs of the Scipios (e.g. Fig. 110) include letters painted in vermilion (*minium*). The custom of painting letters in black on a white ground is mentioned in the *lex* Process of making inscriptions.  
*Acilia repetundarum* of 122 B.C. (*C. I. L.* i 198, 14, *in tabula, in albo, atramento scriptos*). *Fasti* painted in red or black have been found on the walls of Rome, and in black on the buildings of Pompeii, and other painted inscriptions have been preserved in large numbers. The accuracy characteristic of the lettering of inscriptions cut in bronze or stone proves that the letters must have been first painted, or at least outlined, before they were incised, and there is reason for believing that patterns of the different letters were used for this purpose. The next step was for the stone-cutter (*marmorarius* or *lapidarius*) to cut the letters out of the stone (*scalpere, sculperere* or *insculpere*) with a chisel (*scalprum*) and hammer. On certain inscriptions we have actual representations of the

<sup>1</sup> For further details see Mommsen in *Hermes*, xxii (1887), and conspectus in Cagnat, 30—34, or Egbert, 72—81.

<sup>2</sup> For §§ 1096—1100 the primary authority is Hübner's *Exempla*, pp. lii—lxxxiii.

tools used (cp. Daremberg and Saglio, *s.v.* *Inscriptiones*, fig. 4067, and references there given). The shape of the incision is neither curved nor oblong, but an acute angle resembling the letter V. The lines of the lettering were either marked out previously by means of a cord covered with vermilion, or faintly cut with a rule (as in the epitaph of Scipio, the *flamen Dialis*, Fig. 114). The letters, when completed, were often picked out with vermilion, a practice mentioned by Pliny (xxxiii 122). For large public monuments the letters were sometimes separately made of bronze or lead, and affixed to the stone with rivets. On the architrave of the triumphal Arch at Orange, it is only the holes left by these rivets that enable us to restore part of the lost inscription:—**TI·CAESARI·DIVI·AVGVSTI·F·DIVI·IVLI·NEPOTI·AVGVSTO** (Daremberg and Saglio, fig. 4070).

For inscriptions on bronze, the person employed was an *aerarius* or *caelator*, and the corresponding verb was *incidere*, which is also applied to inscriptions on stone. Sometimes the letters are only indicated by a series of points impressed on the surface of the plate. A large *stilus* called a *graphium* was used to scratch inscriptions on the walls of buildings (generally before the cement had hardened). Many such *graffiti* have been found at Pompeii (Fig. 118). Lettering of different kinds, varying with the material, is also found on pottery, on bricks and tiles, and on plates of gold, silver, bronze or lead.

In the Museum at Palermo we have an inscription in which a professional stone-mason advertises his establishment in two parallel columns, in Greek and in Latin:—**στίλαι | ἐνθάδε | τυποῦνται καὶ | χαράσσονται | ναοῖς ἱεροῖς | σὺν ἐνεργείαις | δημοσίαις |**, *tituli | heic | ordinantur et | sculpuntur | aidibus sacreis | cum operum publicorum (sic)*. Similarly, in a Roman inscription:—**D(is) M(anibus) | Titulos scribendos uel | si quid op(er)is marmorari(i) opus fuerit hic habes** (Hübner's *Exempla*, p. xxx; *C. I. L.* x 7296 and vi 9556).

**1102.** Stamps of hard material are often used to impress letters in relief on the surface of articles made of clay or terracotta. Letters in relief are also stamped on arms and on household utensils, on pigs of metal, and on water-pipes, missiles, tablets and tokens of lead (§ 1111—1119).

**1103.** A rude type of lettering called *scriptura vulgaris* is characteristic of inscriptions made by an inexperienced or unprofessional hand. The letters are cut without the aid of outlines. Sometimes holes are first punched out, to mark the shape of the letters. These holes are then rudely joined together, as in the inscriptions in quarries near Hadrian's Wall in the north of England, (1) by the side of Banksburn, near Lanercost (*C. I. L.* vii 872; Hübner's *Exempla*, no. 1185); and (2) on the 'written rock' of Helbeck, about two miles south of Brampton, *Vex(illatio) legionis II Aug(ustae), of(icina) Apr(ilis), sub Agricola optione*, a lieutenant of 207 A.D. (*C. I. L.* vii 912). The following is Bruce's copy of the first two words, where Hübner suspects that for **IE** we

*Scriptura  
vulgaris.*



should read II, the vulgar form of E. It is to the large characters of this



Fig. 120. From the 'written rock' on the river Gelt (*Lapidarium Septentrionale*, iii 469, p. 234, c. 13. Letters about 4 inches high).

'written rock' that Tennyson compares the inscription seen on certain slabs of rock in *Gareth and Lynette*:—

'In letters like to those the vexillary  
Hath left crag-carven o'er the streaming Gelt'.

Similar unprofessional work is often found in the remains of fortified camps, in ordinary epitaphs, and in cases where additions are made to the normal columns of *Fasti* or new names added to those of the emperors first mentioned on Roman milestones.

1104. It has been said of language, that 'the perfection of strength is clearness united with precision; but' that 'to this combination Latin is utterly unequal; from the vagueness and uncertainty of meaning which characterises its separate words, to be perspicuous it must be full'. Nevertheless the Latin of inscriptions can certainly be 'perspicuous' without being 'full', and, like the Roman legal and technical style, it commends itself by its 'clearness and precision'. Even in modern times Latin continues to be the language of dedicatory inscriptions and of epitaphs. Of an English epitaph in the island of Skye, Dr Johnson said, 'the inscription should have been in Latin, as every thing intended to be universal and permanent should be'<sup>3</sup>.

The brevity generally characteristic of the lapidary Latin style is further exemplified by the constant use of abbreviations for words of frequent occurrence. These abbreviations consist of the first or the first two or three letters of the word. At first there was no distinction of number or of case. H·L stood for *haec lex* or *hac lege*; H for *heres*, *heredem* or *heredes*. In the second and third centuries the plural was commonly denoted by doubling the consonant:—D·N, *dominus noster*, has for its plural DD·NN, *domini nostri*. Long lists of such abbreviations are given in the *index* to each volume of the *Corpus*, in the *Exempla* of Wilmanns, and of Hübner (p. lxii f), and in the Manual of Cagnat, reprinted in that of Egbert. In the present chapter we must be

Language.

Abbreviations.

<sup>1</sup> J. H. Newman on Cicero in *Enc. Metr.*, *Roman Lit.* p. 367 f, 1852.

<sup>2</sup> Mommsen, *R. H.*, Book II chap. ix (ii 114 ed. 1894).

<sup>3</sup> *Tour to the Hebrides*, 5 Sept. 1773.

content with noticing at the end of each class of inscriptions some of the abbreviations of words or phrases characteristic of that class.

Classification. **1105.** Inscriptions are primarily divided into two classes:—

(I) inscriptions proper (*ἐπιγραφαί, ἐπιγράμματα, tituli*), consisting of characters inscribed on monuments or other objects to denote their purpose, the essential point in each case being the name of an individual and a statement of his relation to the monument or other object.

(II) documents, public or private (*acta, instrumenta, tabulae*), inscribed on durable material, such as metal or stone, with a view to their publication and more or less permanent preservation.

The *tituli* of class (I) are subdivided into (1) epitaphs (*tituli sepulcrales*); (2) dedicatory inscriptions (*t. sacri*); (3) honorary inscriptions (*t. honorarii*); (4) inscriptions on public works (*t. operum publicorum*); (5) inscriptions on moveable objects (*instrumentum domesticum*, etc.).

The *acta* of class (II) are subdivided into (1) treaties (*foedera*); (2) laws (*leges* and *plebiscita*); (3) decrees of the Roman Senate (*senatus consulta*) and of the *coloniae* and *municipia*, the *collegia* and *sodalicia*; (4) decrees of magistrates and emperors (*decreta*, etc.); (5) consular diptychs (*diptycha consularia*); (6) sacred and public documents (*acta sacra et publica*); (7) private documents (*acta priuata*); (8) graffiti on walls (*inscriptiones parietariae*).

**1106.** I (1). The earliest epitaphs, such as those of Praeneste (250—150 B.C.), simply give the name of the deceased, in the nominative case, e.g. *M. Fabrici(s)*<sup>1</sup> *K(aesonis) filios*. (Cp. Ritschl *P. L. M. E.* tab. 36 inf.; 45—47). The following are in constant use as the abbreviations for the most frequent *praenomina*:—

A Aulus.	D Decimus.	Λ (not M') Manius.	Q Quintus.	S(SP) Spurius.
C Gaius.	K Kaeso.	M Marcus.	SER Servius.	TI(B) Tiberius.
CN Gnaeus.	L Lucius.	P Publius.	SEX Sextus.	T Titus.

○ stands for Gaia, and may be used for any woman, e.g. *M-ARRIVS-○-L-DIOMEDES* means 'M. Arrius, freedman of Arria'<sup>2</sup>. On the cinerary urns, found in the vineyard of San Cesario on the *Via Appia* (150—50 B.C.), the date of the death is also given, e.g. *L. Anaui(s)*<sup>3</sup> *L. f. eidibus Sex(tilibus)*. In course of time the profession of the deceased, the age, with formulae such as *hic cubat* (H-C), *hic situs est* (H-S-E), were added, as well as laudatory epithets.

In the case of distinguished persons, it had become customary, about 250 B.C., to supplement the ordinary *tituli* with poetic *dogia*. The original epitaph of Scipio Barbatus was simply his name written in vermillion (upper

<sup>1</sup> Old form of *Fabricius*.

<sup>2</sup> M. Arrius Gaiae (= Arriae) libertus Diomedes. Wilmanns, no. 1933.

<sup>3</sup> *Anauis* (*Annauius*), old form of *Annaeus*.

part of Fig. 111); at a later date an *elogium* was added below in Saturnian verse, the metre used in the case of three other Scipios, while Scipio Hispanus was honoured in two elegiac couplets (Dessau, i 1—3). In contrast to the *elogia* we have the following simple epitaph found in Padua, which is possibly that of the historian Livy:—T. Liuius C. f. sibi et | suis, | T. Liuius T. f. Prisco f., | T. Liuius T. f. Longo f., | Cassiae Sex. f. Primae | uxori (Dessau, i 568).

In and after the Augustan age, epitaphs regularly begin with *Dis Manibus* or *Dis Manibus Sacrum*, at first written in full, but afterwards abbreviated as **D·M**, or **D·M·S**. Next follows the name or description, either in the nominative (with *hic situs est* or the like), or in the genitive, or the dative, with or without official titles, e.g. *libertis libertabus posterisque eorum* (L·L·P·Q·E). The age is expressed in full in the ablative, *uixit annis* (tot), more frequently than in the accusative, or is abbreviated, as Q·V·A·P·M., *qui uixit annis plus minus*. Salutations addressed to the dead by the passers-by are placed either at the beginning or at the end of the epitaph, e.g. *aue* or *salue*, or *sit tibi terra levis* (S·T·T·L); and similarly with salutations addressed by the dead to the living, e.g. *aue*, *salue* or *uale uiator*; *tu qui legis uales et cum uoles uenito*; *bene ualeat is qui hunc titulum perlegit meum*. The deceased is also represented as saying of his present abode, *iuuenis feci, ut senex habitem* (C. I. L. viii 2177). Among other inscriptions are *non fueram, non sum, nescio, non ad me pertinet* (v 1939); the epitaph of an actor, *aliquoties mortuus sum, sed sic nunquam* (iii 3980); of the modest matron, *hic sita est Anymone Marci optima et pulcherrima, | lanifica pia pudica frugi casta domiseda*, and the longer epitaph ending with the line *domum seruauit, lanam fecit; dixi, abei* (Dessau, ii 930 f). Facts relating to the site are often added, such as *locus publice datus decreto decurionum*, **L·P·D·D·D**; or the dimensions of the place of burial, this being a characteristic of the Augustan age (cp. Hor. *Serm.* i 8, 12 f); or formulae forbidding desecration or alienation:—*huic monumento dolus malus abesto*, **H·M·D·M·A**; *hoc monumentum heredem non sequetur*, **H·M·H·N·S** (cp. Hor. *l.c.*). The epitaph often included the name or description of the person dedicating the monument, the monument dedicated, followed by a verbal phrase, such as *ponendum curauit* (**P·C**), with mention of the circumstances or motive, e.g. *ob memoriam custodiendam adque propagandam*, and the name of the person to whom it is dedicated in the dative:—*amico bene merenti* (**A·B·M**); *sibi et suis* (**S·ET·S**). Sometimes the sepulchral inscription is an actual document, a *laudatio funebris* (Dessau, ii 924—9), or a will (*ib.* 918). For many other examples of *tituli sepulcrales*, see Dessau, ii pp. 834—950.

1107. (2) Dedicatory inscriptions (*tituli sacri*) are found on objects consecrated to the gods, such as vases, altars, metal plates and votive tablets or votive statues or temples, with the name of the god in the genitive, e.g. **VOLCANI**.

Dedicatory  
inscriptions.

**POCOLOM** (Dessau, ii 2); or in the dative, e.g. *Ioui optimo maximo* (I·O·M), *Genio populi Romani* (G·P·R), followed by phrases such as *dono dedit* (D·D), or *uotum soluit laetus lubens merito* (V·S·L·L·M) (cp. Catullus, xxxi 4). Among the earliest of such inscriptions are those from the sacred grove of Pisaurum (Ritschl, tab. xliii f). The following is the votive inscription in Saturnian lines set up by L. Mummius, the conqueror of Corinth:—

L. Mummi L. f. cos.

Duct(u) | auspicio imperioque | eius Achaia capt(a),  
Corinto | deleto Romam redieit | triumphans.  
Ob hasce | res bene gestas quod | (is) bello uouerat, |  
hanc aedem et signu(m) | Herculis uictoris |  
imperator dedicat

(Dessau, i p. 6; cp. Lindsay, 71 f).

The next is a dedication (possibly) on the part of Juvenal, found near his birthplace, Aquinum:—

C(ere)ri sacrum | (D. Iu)nius Iuuenalis | (trib.) coh. (I) Delmatarum, | II(uir) quinq.,  
flamen | diui Vespasiani, | uouit dedicau(it)que | sua pec(unia). (Dessau, i 570; many other examples, *ib.* ii 1—288.)

Our third example may be taken from a bronze tablet, found on the Great St Bernard and now in the British Museum, in which the dedication to the Pennine Jupiter is represented by a series of dots punched into the plate, and forming the words *Poenino sacrum*, etc. (Hübner, *Ex.* 929).

**1108.** (3) Honorary inscriptions (*tituli honorarii*) were placed on the pedestals of statues raised in honour of men of mark. The

Honorary  
inscriptions.

custom was of Greek origin, and in early Latin inscriptions of this type the Greek custom of placing the name in the accusative and omitting the verb is retained, e.g. *Italicei L. Cornelium Scipionem (i.e. Asiagenum) honoris causa* (193 B.C.; Dessau, i 194). The memory of the earlier Scipios had already been honoured with poetical *elogia* inscribed on their tombs. The earliest public inscription of an honorary type, written in prose, was that on the *columna rostrata* in honour of C. Duilius, consul of 260 B.C., the victor of Mylae (Plin. *N. H.* xxxiv 20; Quint. i 7, 12). This is only preserved in a copy ascribed to the time of Claudius, in which archaic forms are inaccurately imitated (Ritschl, *Opusc.* iv 204; cp. Allen, p. 67 f, and Lindsay, p. 45 f). See Fig. 121.

*Elogia* were subsequently inscribed on the base of public works, such as the Arch built by Q. Fabius Maximus in 121 and restored by his namesake in 56 B.C. (Cic. *in Vat.* 28), with inscriptions in honour of Aem. Paullus and of his son Scipio Africanus minor (Dessau, i 13 ult.). We have a bust in Rome inscribed *Quintus Hortensius*, and another at Madrid bearing the name *M. Cicero*, an. LXIII (*ib.* i 568). Augustus adorned his *forum* with statues of celebrated men beginning with Aeneas and Romulus and including Appius Claudius Caecus, Q. Fabius Maximus, and Marius and Lucullus (*ib.* i 15—18). Inscriptions such as these are





From the age of Sulla onwards we also find inscriptions in which the name of the person honoured is put in the dative, e.g. *L. Cornelio L. f. | Sullae Felici | dictatori, | uicus laci Fund(anii)* (Dessau, i 195). In the Augustan age fuller and more elaborate forms came into use. In addition to the names and titles of the person honoured and the person or community raising the statue, we have clauses stating the motive, *honoris causa* (H.C), or the circumstances, *ex senatus consulto* (E.S.C), or *decurionum decreto* (D.D), *ponendum curauit* (P.C) and ending with verbal phrases such as *statuam censuit ponendam*. (Cp., in general, the *tituli uirorum*, etc. in Dessau, i 22—568.)

**1109.** (4) Inscriptions on public buildings, including temples, bridges, arches and aqueducts (*tituli operum publicorum*), are of the same general type as the earliest honorary inscriptions. The earliest example commemorates the completion of the restoration of the temple of Iupiter Capitolinus (78— B.C.): —*Q. Lutatius Q. f. Q. (n.) Catulus cos. | substructionem et tabularium | de s(enatus) s(ententia) faciundum coerauit (ei)demque probauit* (Dessau, i 10 no. 35). Agrippa dedicated his Pantheon in 27 B.C. in the following terms:—*M. Agrippa L. f. cos. tertium fecit (ib. i 35 no. 129)*. To the first of these forms we have a parallel in the inscription on a temple near Corfinium:—*pagi de decreto faciendum curarunt probaruntque (C. I. L. i 1379)*. Phrases, such as *faciendum curauit idemque probauit*, are often abbreviated (F.C.I.Q.P). The architect's name is seldom added. An inscription in front of the temple at Aletrium describes the local censor as having superintended the laying out of all the streets, with the play-ground and the meat-market, and the construction of a colonnade, a clock, a law-court, a swimming-bath and an aqueduct (Dessau, ii 353; Lindsay, 83).

Of the dedicatory inscriptions of the Roman aqueducts none are earlier than the Augustan age (Dessau, ii 415—429). There are three such inscriptions above the *Porta Tiburtina*, relating to the *Aqua Iulia* of 5 B.C., restored by Seuerus in 196 and Caracalla in 212 A.D. (Wilmanns, no. 765; Middleton's *Ancient Rome*, ii 340). The three above the *Porta Praenestina*, relating to the *Aqua Claudia* and *Anio novus*, completed by Claudius and restored by Vespasian in 71 and Titus in 81 A.D., are printed below:—

TI. CLAVDIVS. DRVSI. F. CAISAR. AVGVSTVS. GERMANICVS. PONTIF. MAXIM  
 TRIBVNICIA. POTESTATE. XII. COS. V. IMPERATOR. XXVII. PATER. PATRIAE  
 AQVAS. CLAVDIAM. EX. FONTIBVS. XVI. VOCABANTVR. CAERVLEVS. ET.  
 CVRTIVS. A. MILLIARIO. XXXXV  
 ITEM. ANIENEM. NOVAM. A. MILLIARIO. LXII. SVA. IMPENSA. IN VRBEM.  
 PERDVCENDAS. CVRAVIT  
 IMP. CAESAR. VESPASIANVS. AVGVST. PONTIF. MAX. TRIB. POT. II. IMP.  
 VI. COS. III. DESIG. IIII. P. P  
 AQVAS. CVRTIAM. ET. CAERVLEAM. PERDVCTAS. A. DIVO. CLAVDIO. ET.  
 POSTEA. INTERMISSAS. DILAPSASQVE

PER ANNOS. NOVEN. SVA. IMPENSA. VRBI. RESTITVIT  
 IMP. T. CAESAR. DIVI. F. VESPASIANVS. AVGVSTVS. PONTIFEX. MAXIMVS.  
 TRIBVNIC  
 POTESTATE. X. IMPERATOR. XVII. PATER. PATRIAE. CENSOR. COS. VIII  
 AQVAS. CVRTIAM. ET. CAERVLEAM. PERDVCTAS. A DIVO. CLAVDIO. ET.  
 POSTEA  
 A DIVO. VESPASIANO. PATRE. SVO. VRBI. RESTITVTAS. CVM. A CAPITE.  
 AQVARVM. A SOLO. VETVSTATE. DILAPSAE. ESSENT. NOVA. FORMA.  
 REDVCENDAS. SVA. IMPENSA. CVRAVIT

Wilmanns, no. 764 (cp. Schreiber's *Atlas*, lvii 1, and Middleton's  
*Ancient Rome*, ii 344).

We also have a large number of inscriptions recording the construction or repair of roads and bridges (Dessau, ii 430—450). Of the latter the best known are those on the *pons Fabricius* of 62 B.C. (*ib.* 447; Ritschl, tab. 87; Middleton, ii 367).

Roads and  
 bridges.

Inscriptions on milestones (*miliaria*) and boundary-stones (*cippi terminales*) include names of places and records of distances, which throw light on the topography of Rome, and the geography of the Provinces. Those on the milestones of the Republic are simple in form, giving the name of the builder of the road and the number of miles to the principal place in the neighbourhood. Thus, on a stone column, 4 feet high and 2 feet broad and tapering towards the base, found near Hadria on the Padus, we have the words P · POPILIVS · C · F | COS | JXXXI (*i.e.* 81 miles from Ariminum); but the same person, P. Popilius Laenas, consul of 132 B.C., is far more fully commemorated on the *miliarium* found on the site of Forum Popilii near Polla in Lucania, which includes an *elogium* on his own services.

Milestones.

VIAM FECEIT AB REGIO AD CAPVAM ET  
 IN EA VIA PONTEIS OMNES MILIARIOS  
 TABELARIOSQVE POSUIT HINC SVNT  
 NOVCERIA MEILIA LI · CAPVAM XXXIII  
 AVRANVM LXXIII · COSENTIAM CXXIII  
 VALENTIAM CLXXX · AD FRETVM AF  
 STATVAM CCXXXII · REGIVM CCXXXVII  
 SVMA AF CAPVAREGIVM MEILIA CCC  
 ET EIDEM DRAE TORIN XXII  
 SICILIA FVGITEIVOS ITALICORVM  
 CONQVAEISIVE I · REDIDEIQVE  
 HOMINES · DCCCCXVII · EIDEMQVE  
 PRIMVS FECEIT DE AGRO POPLICO  
 ARATORIBVS CEDERENT PAASTORES  
 FORVM AEDISQVE POPLICAS HEIC FECEIT

Fig. 122. Miliarium Popilianum (P. L. M. E. 51 b),  $\frac{3}{4}$ .

Viam feci ab Regio ad Capuam, et in ea uia ponteis omneis, miliarios tabelariosque poseiuei.

Hince sunt Nouceriam meilia	↯I
Capuam	XXCIII
Muranum	↯XXIII
Cosentiam	CXXIII
Valentiam	C↯XXX
ad fretum ad statuam	CCXXXI
Regium	CCXXXVII
suma af Capua Regium meilia	CCCXXII (obliterated)

Et eidem praetor in Sicilia fugiteiuos Italicorum conqueisiuei, redideique homines DCCCCXVII. Eidemque primus feci, ut de agro poplico aratoribus cederent paastores. Forum aedisque poplicas heic feci (Dessau, i 7 § 23; cp. Lindsay, 74—76).

Augustus in 2 B.C. inscribed on every milestone of his road from the Baetis to Gades:—*a Baete et Iano Augusto ad Oceanum* (*C. I. L.* ii 4701), and Claudius on those of the road founded by his father Drusus:—*uiam Claudiam Augustam quam Drusus pater Alpibus bello patefactis derexerat munit ab Albino* (or *a flumine Pado*) *ad flumen Danuuium* (*C. I. L.* v 8002 f). The names of the Alpine tribes conquered by Augustus were recorded on the *tropaeum Alpium*, the remains of which are still to be seen at Turbia. The inscription on this trophy is quoted by Pliny (iii 136), and the extant portion is preserved in the Museum at Saint-Germain (*C. I. L.* v 7817).

Of the boundary-stones, the earliest are the two found at Venusia declaring certain places *aut sacrom aut poublicom locom ese* (*C. I. L.* i 185 f). Next come the *cippi* marking out the *ager Campanus* for division among the plebs under the authority of Gaius Gracchus and his two colleagues, *tres uiri agris iudicandis adsignandis*, with the lines and angles of the *cardo* and the *decumanus* (*C. I. L.* i 552—6; Dessau, i 8). We also have boundary-stones between different communities (i 547—9, 583). In Rome there are the *termini ripae Tiberis*, beginning with the Augustan age (Dessau, ii 455), and the *termini* of the *pomerium* of Claudius, Vespasian and Trajan (i nos. 213, 248, 311), and of the *ager publicus* and *priuatus* (ii 459 f). For *tituli operum* . . *publicorum* in general, see *ib.* ii 346—481.

IIII. (5) Inscriptions on moveable objects. *Instrumentum* is a general term denoting articles used in public or private life. These may be (i) articles of metal, such as (a) weights and measures, (b) *tesserae*, (c) armour and missiles, (d) vessels or other articles of gold, silver, bronze, (e) pipes of lead, (f) stamps and seals; (ii) products of mines and quarries; (iii) tiles; and (iv) vessels of clay.

III. (i) (a) weights and measures (*pondera et mensurae*) made of stone, lead or bronze, are generally marked with letters and numbers (either incised or raised in relief) denoting their size. Sometimes they bear inscriptions giving the name of the place where they had been tested, e.g. *exactum ad Castoris*; or *iussu aedilium exactum* ad *Articuliana pondera* i(n) *Capitolio*. Articuleius being one of the aediles of 47 A.D. The following is the inscription (of 72 A.D.) on the 'Farnese Congius', now in Dresden:—IMP·CAESARE | VESPAS·VI | T·CAES·AVG·F·



III cos | MENSURAE | EXACTAE . IN | CAPITOLIO | P X (i.e. 10 pounds). After Trajan the weights and measures were tested by the praefect, e.g. *ex auctoritate Iunii Rustici praefecti urbi* (Dessau, ii 965-7).

III2. (b) *tesserae*, primarily used of small cubes of bone or ivory, is also applied to various kinds of tickets or tokens:—(1) the *tesserae frumentariae*, Tesseræ. entitling the holder to obtain a dole of corn. Such was probably the use of certain leaden counters (*tesserae nummariae*) marked with some attribute of Annona, such as the *modius* or ears of corn, with or without an indication of the time and place of distribution.

(2) Certain *tesserae*, or counters of bone, ivory or lead, sometimes inscribed with Greek names of divinities or poets, and with two numbers, one in Latin and one in Greek, used to be regarded as *tesserae theatrales* entitling the holder to admission to the circus, or the theatre or amphitheatre. But they are now identified as *tesserae lusoriae* used like draughts in the *ludus duodecim scriptorum* (cp. Hülsen, in *Röm. Mitt.* 1896, 227 f).

(3) *tesserae hospitales*, or tokens interchanged between host and guest, are mentioned by Plautus (*Poen.* 958, 1047). These belong to private life, and specimens are preserved in Rome and Vienna. Similar tokens relating to public life, and forming a compact between one community and another, or between a community and a private person, were recorded on bronze tablets known as *tabulae patronatus et hospitii*, presented by a community to its patron. Thus L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the grandfather of Nero, was made patron of a *pagus* in N. Africa (cp. Dessau, ii 528-537; Hübner, *Ex.* 862-887).

(4) The *tesserae gladiatoriae* are small oblong pieces of bone or ivory, with a handle or a hole at one end, and with inscriptions distributed over the four long faces (see *British Museum Guide to . . Greek and Roman Life*, p. 75). The inscription has (1) the name of a person, whether slave or freedman, (2) that of his owner or trainer, (3) the word *spectavit* or the abbreviation *sp.*, *spe.* or *spect.*, (4) the month, with or without the day, and (5) the consuls of the year (this last item, which determines the date, has led to their being called *tesserae consulares*; they extend over the first century B.C. and the first A.D.). The subject of *spectavit* is the gladiator, who, on the date specified, received this ticket of discharge, and 'took his place as a spectator' on being released from the arena. In a single *tessera* from Arles (only preserved in MS) we have *Anchial(us) Sirti L(ucii) s(eruus) spectat. num. mense Febr. M. Tul(lio) C. Ant(onio) cos.* (63 B.C.). SPECTAT . NNN is interpreted by Mommsen as *spectat(or) num(erator)*, and by Ritschl as *spectatus munere*. The latter view would make it parallel to the phrase in Horace (*Ep.* i 1, 2), *spectatum satis et donatum iam rude* (Ritschl, *Opusc.* iv 572-656; Hübner, *Ex.* 1194-9; Dessau, ii 309 f; Bursian's *Jahresb.* lvi (1888) 103 f; Egbert, p. 260).

(5) The *tesserae conviviales* were tickets of admission to public banquets, marked with numbers which probably indicated the place reserved for the holder.

III3. (c) *Armour*. The 'Sword of Tiberius', found at Mainz, and now in the British Museum (*Roman Life*, 102-4), was probably presented to an officer who served under Germanicus; it is inscribed FELICITAS . TIBERI and VIC . AVG, *Victoria Augusti*. The shield was sometimes marked with the name of the owner and that of his legion and cohort. Thus the *umbo* of the shield of a Roman legionary, adorned with two military standards, and figures of the four seasons and of Mars and an eagle and an ox, found near the north of the Tyne, is faintly inscribed:—*Leg(ionis) VIII Aug(ustae); c(enturia) Iul(ii) Magni; Iun(i) Dubitati* (C. I. L. vii 495; Hübner's *Ex.* 942).

Leaden sling-bolts (*glandes plumbeae*), oval in form and pointed at both ends, are inscribed with letters in relief denoting the name of the praetor, as in the bolt at Asculum used in the Social War of 90-88 B.C., inscribed T. Laf(renius) pr(aetor), (C. I. L. ix 6086, 1). They may also be inscribed with the name of the people making war, as *Itali* (on the bolt just quoted); or the person, as *Cn. Mag(nus) impl(erator)*, on a bolt used in the war waged against Julius Caesar by *Cn. Pompeius Magni filius* (C. I. L. ii 4962); or the maker; or the corps of slingers. Missiles.

Sometimes they bear the word *feri*, or insulting messages to the foe:—*em tibi malum malo; fugitui peristis; pertinacia uos radicitus tollet* (*C. I. L.* ix pp. 631–647; *Eph. Ep.* vi; Bursian, lvi, 1888, 107–113; Egbert, 262, 328).

1114. (d) Among inscriptions on gold, the first place must be assigned to that on the very ancient *fibula* from Praeneste:—*Manios med fhefhaked Numasios* (Fig. 106). Inscriptions are found on gems, and on the gold rings in which they are mounted. Thus **AMO TE** is found on the gem and on the gold of a ring from Aix (*C. I. L.* xii 5692 f).

The various portions of the silver plate from Hildesheim are stamped with the weight of each (Dessau, ii 961), and similarly with the silver *lanx* from Corbridge (*C. I. L.* vii 1286). In many cases we find the name or initials of the owner. Among other inscriptions on silver may be mentioned the itinerary from Gades to Rome on four cups found at the warm springs of Vicarello (*Aquae Apollinares*) in Tuscany (*ib.* xi p. 496 f). There is a very short itinerary of some stations on or near Hadrian's Wall on a bronze cup found in Wiltshire (*ib.* vii 1291; Hübner's *Ex.* 911). The silver mirrors and the bronze jewel-boxes (*cistae*) of Praeneste are inscribed with the names of Greek gods or heroes, and (in two or three examples) with the name of the maker or owner. Thus the celebrated *cista Ficoronia* bears on the lid the inscription

ΛΟΝΙΝΟΣ·ΡΛΑΥΤΙΝΟΣ·ΜΕΔ·ΡΟΜΑΙ·FECID  
ΔΙΔΥΔΙΑ·ΜΑΚΟΛΥΙΑ·ΦΙΛΕΛΙ·DEDIT

(*C. I. L.* xiv 4112; Dessau, ii 951).

The two lines are placed thus :

.....VIDVID  
ΛΟΝΙΝΟΣ.....

Conway, *Italic Dialects*, i 321.

Among the inscriptions on the numerous bronze vessels exported from Italy and found in various parts of Europe may be mentioned those on the handle of a bronze *patera* with the name of the maker stamped in relief in small characters, surrounded by another inscription formed by a series of dots ending with the abbreviation for *uotum soluit libens merito* (Hübner's *Ex.* 933). The collars of bronze worn by slaves bore inscriptions such as *tene me, ne fugiam, et reuoca me in...* (Dessau, ii 982 f).

1115. (e) Lead water-pipes (*fistulae plumbeae aquariae*) bear inscriptions in relief dating from the age of Augustus to the end of the third century. The earliest have only the name of the emperor; those of the second century add that of the *procurator*, or other official, and that of the *officinator*, under whose direction the pipe was made, or of the slave who made it. In special cases the inscription gives the name of the owner of the house, or the capacity of the pipe (cp. Dessau, ii 975 f).

1116. (f) Seals (*signacula*) for stamping inscriptions in relief on softer substances were mainly made of bronze. They include the name of the owner of the article stamped, and sometimes that of the slave employed. They were also used to stamp certain kinds of provisions, e.g. *C. I. L.* x 8058, 18, *inscriptio impressa pani*. The passage of Pliny, *cibi quoque ac potus anulo uindicantur a rapina* (xxxiii 26), need only refer to the use of a signet-ring to seal up stores.

A special class of *signacula*, with the letters cut on each of the four outside edges of the small rectangular tablets of statite or slate, was used by oculists for stamping the packets containing the medicament prescribed. Each of the edges bears an inscription, usually in two lines, giving the name of the oculist, and the remedy, and the malady for which it is to be used. The following are the inscriptions on a specimen, found in England, and now in the British Museum;—

M·IVL·SATYRI DIASMYR|NES POST IMPET(UM) LIPPIT(UDINIS)  
 M·IVL·SATYRI PENE|CIL(LUM) LENE EX OVO  
 M·IVL·SATYRI DIA|LEPIDOS AD ASPR(ITUDINEM)  
 M·IVL·SATYRI DIALI|BANUM AD SUPPURAT(IONES)

*C. I. L.* xiii (6) p. 579.

(Cp. Hübner's *Ex.* p. 435; Espérandieu, in *C. I. L.* xiii (pars 6), 1906; Dessau, ii 983 f; *Brit. Mus., Roman Life*, p. 182.) On the sole of a bronze foot we have a stamp enabling the vendor of pieces of pottery to impress his wares with the words **VTERE FELIX** (Ricci's tav. lxxv). Stamps were also used to impress inscriptions in relief on vessels of glass, as in the words **BIBE VIVAS MVLTI ANNIS** running round the rim in letters of green on the opal ground of the beautiful bowl in the Museo Trivulzio at Milan (Guhl and Koner, E.T., fig. 453).

1117. (ii) Inscriptions are found on blocks of marble in ancient quarries (as those in Lebanon, and near Hadrian's Wall), or at the Roman emporium on the Tiber. They include the number of the block, the name of the quarry, the consuls of the year, the officials or slaves in charge, and the emperor to whom the quarry belongs (cp. Dessau, ii 980 f). Products of  
quarries and  
mines.

Figs of silver, bronze, or lead, found in England, Spain and Sardinia, as well as in Italy, are stamped with the name of the emperor, and the place where the metal was obtained. At Wookey hole, near the Mendip hills, a block of lead belonging to 49 A.D. was found bearing the inscription:—*Ti. Claudius Caesar Aug(ustus) p(ontifex) m(aximus) trib(unicia) p(otestate) VIIII imp(erator) XVI. De Britan(nicis)*. Others are inscribed *De Cea(ngis)* or *De Ceangi(s)*, (the *Cangi* of Tac. *Ann.* xii 32), or *metalli Lutudare(n)s(is)*, from the mines of Lutudaron, between Leicester and Chester (*C. I. L.* vii p. 220 f; Hübner's *Ex.* 1204-13; Dessau, ii 979 f).

1118. (iii) Ancient tiles (*tegulae*) have been found near Parma, Veleia and Placentia, bearing the names of consuls between 76 and 11 B.C. In Rome the consuls are not named until the second century A.D. Tiles of the last century of the Republic, or the first of the Empire, bear rectangular stamps with the inscription in a single line. From the age of Claudius to that of Hadrian, the normal type is that of a circle with a far smaller circle cut out of the circumference, bearing an inscription in two concentric circles, e.g. *Opus doliare Dionysi Domitiae P. filiae Lucillae, Paeto et Aproniano consulibus* (123 A.D., Hübner's *Ex.* 1214; cp. *Brit. Mus. Guide*, p. 154). In the centre we usually find a decorative figure by way of trade-mark, sometimes referring to the name of the owner of the kiln, e.g. a wolf for *Lupus*, a crown for *Stephanus*. Tiles used by soldiers in building their quarters are stamped with the name of the cohort, legion, or army. Roofing-tiles were stamped with a decorative trade-mark. Flange-tiles have been found in London, inscribed **P·P·BR·LON**, probably *publicani provinciae Britannicae Londinienses* (*C. I. L.* vii 1235; Birch, *Ancient Pottery*, 469-490). Tiles.

1119. (iv) Vessels of clay, including lamps, *lucernae*, and jars of various sizes ranging from the small *patellae* and *pelues* to the intermediate *amphorae*, and the huge *dolia*, are stamped with the name of the maker, merchant, or owner. Vessels of clay. The inscriptions include abbreviations of the words *fecit*, *manu*, *officina* or *figlina*. The letters are either impressed or in relief. On the wine-jars we find the name of the wine, and on the maker or merchant, and the consuls of the year (as implied in Horace, *C.* iii 21, 1; *Ep.* i 5, 4); e.g. in red letters below the neck of an *amphora* from the Esquiline:—*Ti. Claudio P. Quinctilio cos.* (13 B.C.), *a(n)te d(iem) K(al.) Iun(ias)*; *uinum diffusum quod natum est duobus Lentulis cos.* (18 B.C.); *autocratos* (cp. Athen. 32 f). (Cp. Dessau, ii 954-961.)

1120. II. The second great class of inscriptions consists of Documents (*acta* or *instrumenta*) published as inscriptions on stone or metal. These fall into the following subdivisions:— Documents.

(1) Treaties (*foedera*, cp. p. 730). The only Italian treaty recorded in an extant inscription is that relating to the Oscan *ciuitas libera* of Bantia drawn up in 133—118 B.C., and containing part of the concluding portion of an agreement in Latin and in Oscan, providing for the annual election of a *iudex* (*C. I. L.* i 197; Allen, no. 103), where the phrase *lex plebeiae scitum* implies that the Latin document may have been a *lex de foedere* (cp. Conway's *Italic Dialects*, i 22—24, and, on the language, Lindsay, 80—83). The oath sworn by the citizens of the *ciuitas foederata* of Arrium in Lusitania, on the accession of Caligula in 37 A.D., may be regarded as a *foedus* (*C. I. L.* ii 172). The *tesserae hospitales*, already noticed (§ 1112 (3)), are of the nature of compacts.

1121. (2) Laws (including *leges* and *plebiscita*). (1) The earliest and most important of those preserved is the *lex Acilia repetundarum* (122 B.C.), inscribed on a bronze plate about 6 feet broad in 90 lines of 200—240 letters each (*C. I. L.* i 198; *P. L. M. E.* tab. 23—25; cp. Lindsay, 84—88). On the back of the *lex Acilia* is (2) the *lex agraria* of 111 B.C., the last of the enactments made after the death of Gaius Gracchus with a view to annulling his agrarian laws (*ib.* i 200; tab. 26—28). (3) The *lex Cornelia de uiginti quaestoribus*, being the eighth tablet of Sulla's legislation (*ib.* i 202; tab. 29; cp. Lindsay, 90f). (4) The *plebiscitum* of 71 B.C., confirming the autonomy of Termessus in Pisidia (*ib.* i 204; tab. 31 partly copied in Ricci, tav. xxxiv; Dessau, i 11 f). (5) The *lex Rubria de ciuitate Galliae cisalpiniae* (49 B.C.), drawn up in a more convenient form, in two columns, with numbered divisions, of which the extant bronze tablet is the fourth (*ib.* i 205; tab. 32; cp. Lindsay, 96 f). (6) The *lex Iulia municipalis* (45 B.C.), found near Heraclea, on the reverse of a much older Greek decree of that place, and dealing with the distribution of corn, the duties of the aediles, and the rules of municipal government (i 206; tab. 33 f; Dessau, ii 492 f; Lindsay, 97 f). See texts in Bruns, *Fontes Iuris Romani antiqui*, ed. 7, 1909.

Under the Empire *leges* assumed the form of *senatus consulta* and imperial *constitutiones*. It was as a *senatus consultum* that the *leges de imperio*, on the accession of an emperor, were promulgated, e.g. the *lex de imperio Vespasiani* (67 A.D.), recorded on a bronze tablet found in Rome (vi 930; Dessau, i 67; Rushforth, *Lat. Hist. Inscr.*, no. 70).

The constitutions given to *ciuitates* were also called *leges*, e.g. (1) the *lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae* (Osuna in Spain), which was granted in 44 B.C., and is partly preserved in three bronze tablets of the time of Vespasian (Dessau, ii 502 f); (2) the *lex Salpensana*, and (3) the *lex Malacitana*, granted by Domitian to the *municipia* of Salpensana and Malaca in Spain (*ib.* ii 516 f); (4) the *lex metalli Vipascensis*, granted by one of the Flavian emperors to a mining settlement in S. Portugal (*ib.* ii 682 f).

1122. (3) Of the *Senatus Consulta* of the Roman people the earliest preserved as an inscription is (1) part of the *S. C. Lutatianum*, declaring Asclepiades of Clazomenae and his comrades *amici populi Romani* (*C. I. L.* i 203; tab. 30). We also have (2) fragments of decrees on the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C. and 47 A.D., preserved on a marble slab (vi 877)<sup>1</sup>; (3) fragments in honour of Germanicus and the younger Drusus (vi 911 f); (4) regulations on the demolition and rebuilding of houses in Rome (41—46, and 56 A.D.), on a bronze plate found at Herculaneum (x 1401; Dessau, ii 480); (5) a permit for a market in the *saltus Beguensis* in N. Africa (viii 270); and (6) a *Senatus Consultum* on Cyzicus, now in the British Museum (iii sup. 7000).

Of the municipal decrees we have a far larger number, e.g. the *lex (Puteolana) parietis faciendo* (105 B.C.), Hübner's *Ex. 1072*; Egbert, 378; Dessau, ii 346 f; and the two *decreta Pisana* of 3—4 A.D., in honour of Lucius and Gaius Caesar, the grandsons of Augustus (Dessau, i 36—39).

Among municipal inscriptions may be mentioned those of Pompeii, including (a) monumental inscriptions cut in stone on public buildings, on pedestals, or on tombs; (b) public notices painted on the walls in bright red or in

<sup>1</sup> For the *Acta* of the *ludi* of 17 B.C. see § 1129 *infra*.



black, especially those recommending a particular candidate as *uirum bonum*, V·B, urging his election in the phrase, *oro uos faciatis*, O·V·F, or making a personal appeal involving a pledge of future support, *Sabinum aed(ilem)*, *Procul*, *fac, et ille te faciet*; (c) notices of public buildings to let; (d) advertisements of animals or articles, lost or found; and (e) announcements of gladiatorial games with the special attraction, *uenatio et uela erunt*, followed by the name of the painter,—the same enterprising person who puts up outside his house:—*Aemilius Celer hic habitat* (Dessau, ii 306 f, 586—608; Mau, c. 55).

Among the *decreta collegiorum* may be noticed the *lex collegii Aesculapi et Hygie* of 153 A.D. (*ib.* ii 739 f); and the *lex collegii Iouis Cerneni* of 167 A.D., Decrees of  
inscribed on a wax-tablet found in Dacia (*C. I. L.* iii p. 924). collegia.

1123. (4) Of the decrees of magistrates under the Republic the earliest extant example is a decree of L. Aemilius Paulus as proconsul in Further Spain Decrees under  
(189 B.C.), setting the Lascutani free from the control of their neighbours the Republic.  
at Hasta. It is incised on a bronze plate.




Fig. 123. Decree of L. Aemilius Paulus, 189 B.C. (from *C. I. L.* ii 5041).

L. Aemilius L. f. inpeirator decreiuit, | utei quei Hastensium seruei | in turri Lascutana habitarent, | leiberei essent; agrum oppidumqu., | quod ea tempestate posedisent, | item possidere habereque | iousit, dum populus senatusque | Romanus uellet. Act. in castreis | a. d. XII k. Febr. (Dessau, i 4, no. 15; Allen, p. 27; Lindsay, p. 57.)

Here, in an inscription five years before the death of Plautus, we have no ablative in -d. Only three years later we have the Letter addressed by the Consuls of 186 B.C. informing the Teurani in the Bruttian peninsula of the terms of the *Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus* (Ritschl, tab. 18; Dessau, i 5; Allen, no. 82; Lindsay, pp. 59—67; cp. Liv. xxxix 8 f). The original bronze plate (called *tabola athena* in the inscription) is now in Vienna. This document, though later in date, is more archaic than the last. The retention of the old ablative in -d (discarded in the decree of 189) is purely a piece of conservative spelling. We have no doubled consonants, and *ai* and *oi* are used throughout except in l. 1, *aedem Duilonai*. On the other hand, we have -us and -um, not -os and -om. In the notice hung up in the sacred grove at Spolegium the final -d is sometimes written, sometimes dropped (Lindsay, 53). Curious verb-forms ending in *d* are found in a similar notice, from Luceria (*ib.* 56 f).

The award of the Minucii in the boundary-dispute between the Genuates and their

tributaries, on a bronze plate found near Genoa, belongs to 117 B.C. (Ritschl, tab. 20, partly copied in Ricci, tav. xxxiii; Allen, no. 104; Dessau, ii 462 f). The substance of a decree relating to the Tiburtes is embodied in a Letter from the praetor L. Cornelius, possibly Sisenna (78 B.C.), on a bronze plate found at Tibur (Dessau, i 6; Allen, no. 105).

1124. The decrees of the imperial age include (1) the award of the proconsul, L. Heluius Agrippa (69 A.D.), on a boundary-dispute in Sardinia (x 7852); (2) the letter to the magistrates of Saepinum and Bouianum in Samnium from the *praefecti praetorio* of 166-9, to protect the farmers of the imperial sheep-walks; inscribed on a stone still to be seen at Saepinum near the present sheep-path, which passes through the gate to Bouianum (ix 2438).

Among the *Constitutiones* of the emperors may be mentioned the edict of Augustus on the aqueduct at Venafrum (Dessau, ii 415 f); of Claudius (46 A.D.) on the Ciuitas Anaunorum (Dessau, i 50); and the celebrated Latin and Greek edict of Diocletian (301 A.D.) *De pretiis rerum uenialium* (C. I. L. iii 801; cp. Dessau, i 144-7); also certain *decreta*, or judicial decisions of the emperor; certain *rescripta*, or provisional decisions in the form of a letter, such as those of Vespasian relating to disputed boundaries in Corsica and Spain (x 8038; ii 1423); the *tabulae alimentariae* of Trajan (Dessau, ii 612 f, 640 f) and the *diplomata militaria* conferring citizenship on foreign soldiers, or legalising the marriage of Roman citizens with foreign women (*ib.* i 389-407; *Brit. Mus., Roman Life*, 8).

The *Oratio* of Claudius (48 A.D.) on the admission of Gallic citizens to public office is engraved on a bronze tablet discovered at Lyons in 1528 (Dessau, i 52; Lindsay, 107), being a copy of the original text of the speech reported by Tacitus (*Ann.* xi 24).

TEMPVSESTIAMTICAESARGERMANICEDETEGERE TEPATRIBVSCONSCRIPTIS  
QVOTENDATORATIO TVA IAM ENIM AD EXTREMOS FINES GALLIAE NARBONENSIS VENISTI

Fig. 124. From the Speech of Claudius at Lyons, 48 A.D.  
(Hübner's *Exempla*, no. 799),  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

Tempus est iam, Ti. Caesar Germanice, detegere té patribus conscriptis, | quo tendat oratio tua; iam enim ad extremos fines Galliae Nar|bonensis uenisti (cp. Bury's *Greek Historians*, 229). Here we have **I** for **i**, also an *apex* in line 1, and in line 2 the point twice placed *within* the letter (to save space).

1125. (5) Among official documents we may here mention the *diptycha consularia*, or ivory tablets including the names and portraits of the consuls with representations of the public spectacles to which they invited the senators and other important personages. They extend from 406 to 541 A.D. A diptych of 487 A.D. bears a portrait of the father of Boëthius, with the following inscription:—Nar(ius) Manl(ius) Boëthius u(ir) c(larissimus) et in(lustris), ex p(raefecto) p(raetorio) p(raefectus) u(rbi) sec(undo), cons(ul) ord(inarius) et patric(ius). (Dessau, i 288-292.)

1126. (6) Among documents connected with religious worship may be noticed the *leges templorum* from Furfo in S. Italy (Lindsay, 93), from Narbo in Gaul, and from Salona in Dalmatia (Dessau, ii 246 f). Also the *sortes*, or small tablets bearing vague and commonplace inscriptions, which were drawn out of an urn, and were regarded as oracular responses, e.g.

C

LAETVS · LVBENS · PETITO · QVOD  
DABITVR · GAVDEBIS · SEMPER

C. I. L. i 1448.

Seventeen of these tablets were found near Padua, having probably been used at the *Fons Apōnus*, a neighbouring seat of divination (*ib.* i p. 268 f, xi 1129 a—c).

1127. On the walls of a temple at Ancȳra we have in the form of a 'sacred inscription' the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, the best preserved copy of a secular document of the highest historical importance as to the life of Augustus, —the *Index rerum a se gestarum*, originally incised on bronze tablets to be placed in front of his mausoleum in Rome (Suet. *Aug.* 101: *C. I. L.* iii p. 769 f; ed. Mommsen, 1865, 1883; small ed. by Diehl, 1908; cp. Lindsay, 104–6). The following is a reduced facsimile of the heading, and of two items. Here again we have the *apex* (§ 1099) and the tall **I** (§ 1096).

RÉRVM·GESTÁRVM·DÍVÍ·AVG  
SVBIECIT·ET·INTENSARVM·QVÁS  
INDVABVS·AHENEL·PILIS·QVÆ·SVNT·RO  
ANNOS·VNDÉVIGINTI·NATVS·EX·ERCITVM·PRIVATO·CONSILIO·ET·PRIVATÁ·IMPENSA·  
CURIAM·ET·CONTINENS·E·CHALCIDICVM·TEMPLV·MQVE·APOLLINIS·IN·

Fig. 125. From the *Monumentum Ancyranum*  
(Hübner's *Exempla*, no. 1090),  $\frac{2}{3}$ .

Rerum gestarum diui Augusti, quibus orbem terra[rum] imperio populi Rom(ani) | subiecit et inpensarum, quas in rem[publicam] populumque Ro[ma]num fecit, incisarum | in duabus aheneis pilis, quae su[n]t Romae positae, exemplar sub[i]ectum

§ 1. Annos undeviginti natus exercitum priuato consilio et priuata impensa | comparaui . . .

§ 19. Curiam et continens ei Chalcidicum, templumque Apollinis in | Palatio cum porticibus . . . feci.

1128. Among documents belonging to the sacerdotal *collegia* the foremost place must be assigned to the *Acta collegii fratrum Arualium*, an ancient corporation revived by Augustus. Their sole duty was to preside at the festival of the *Dea Dia* in May; their place of worship was in the grove of that goddess on the old *Via Campana*, five miles from Rome. It was there that the bronze tablets recording their meetings were found (Ritschl, tab. 36A; Hübner, *Ex.* 1024; Dessau, i 58–61; ii 267–281). On the tablet discovered in 1778 their most ancient *carmen* has been preserved, probably in a corrupted form (Allen, no. 149). The position and the exact dimensions of the places permanently assigned to the *Fratres Aruales* in the amphitheatre are carefully indicated among the *Acta* of the emperor Titus (Hübner, *Ex.* 996, copied in Ricci's tav. lxi).

1129. The *Acta Sacrorum Saecularium* of 17 B.C. were mainly discovered in 1890. We here find an almost complete record of the proceedings on that memorable occasion (Dessau, ii 282–7; Lanciani, *Pagan and Christian Rome*, 73 f, and Appendix; Lindsay, 102 f). We must be content to give a single extract only. On the 3rd of June, after stating that a sacrifice was offered to Apollo and Diana by Augustus and Agrippa in the Palatium, the account continues as follows:

Sacrificioque perfecto puer[i x]xvii quibus denuntiatur erat patrimi et matrimi et puellae totidem | carmen cecinerunt; eo[de]mque modo in Capitolio. | Carmen composuit Q. Hor[at]ius Flaccus. | (*l.* 147–9.)

Acta Collegii  
Fratrum  
Arualium.

Acta Sacrorum  
Saecularium.

1130. The public and sacred documents also include the *Fasti*, which are represented by (1) the *Fasti consulares* (*C. I. L.* i p. 293 f) and *Acta triumphorum* (i p. 453 f). In the former we have the names of the consuls, dictators (and *magistri equitum*), the military tribunes with consular power, and the censor, with the date (of the Catonian era) added after every ten years. They were probably begun at the dedication of the *Regia* of the *pontifex maximus* in 36 B.C., and were supplemented down to about 13 A.D. They are known as the *Fasti Capitolini* from the place of their present preservation.

The *Acta triumphorum* were set up in 12 B.C., when Augustus became *pontifex maximus*. The following belong to 494-3 = 260 f, B.C.




Fig. 126. From the *Acta triumphorum* (Hübner's *Exempla*, no. 949), 1.

C. Duilius M. f(i)lius M. n(epos) co(n)s(ul) primus an(no) CDXCIII naualem (triumphum) de Sicul(is) et classe Poenica egit, k(alendis) interkalar(ibus).

L. Cornelius L. f(i)lius Cn. n(epos) Scipio co(n)s(ul) an(no) CDXCIV de Poenis et Sardin(ia) Corsica, v id(us) Mart(ias). *C. I. L.* i 458.

We have also certain other *Fasti consulares* and *Acta triumphorum*, drawn up by priestly colleges and Italian municipalities as records of public events. The battle of Actium is so recorded in part of the *Fasti* discovered at Amiternum (Hübner's *Ex.* 952).

1131. The *Fasti anni Iuliani* are calendars arranged according to the Julian year, giving lists of all the days of each month in a series of columns, the first of which gives the series of the 8 *litterae nundinales*, A—H, with the several days marked as *fasti* or *nefasti*, and with the names of the festivals added in smaller characters (Dessau, ii 987—993; Hübner's *Ex.* 976), cp. § 220.

1132. Calendars were also prepared for the use of farmers. Two of these were discovered in Rome in the sixteenth century:—(1) the *Ménologium Rusticum*, discovered by Angelo Colocci, and now in the Naples Museum; and (2) the lost *Men. Vallense*, which once belonged to the De la Valle family. The former is engraved on the four upright sides of a cubical marble altar, with three months on each side. At the head of each month is a sign of the zodiac, followed by the name of the month, the number of days, the date of the nones, the number of hours in the day and the night, the name of the sign of the zodiac, and the agricultural *agenda* and the festivals of the months (Dessau, ii 994-6; complete facsimile in Egbert, 369 f; copies in bronze inscribed 'cast in Lauchhammer (N. of Dresden) Ael. Rost').

(7) Among 'private documents' may be mentioned the maledictions written on thin tablets of lead or bronze devoting to destruction the personal enemies of the writer. These were known as *exsecrationes*, *defixiones*, or *deuotiones* (Tac. *Ann.* ii 69; Dessau, ii 996 f). A tablet, still preserved at Bath, invokes dire calamities on the head of one who has stolen a certain napkin (Hübner's *Ex.* 947). A similar tablet is preserved at Lydney Park in Gloucestershire, together with two



bronze plates recording the fulfilment of a vow (*C. I. L.* vii 138—140). The writing on the lead tablets is generally a rude cursive of an illiterate type<sup>1</sup>. The cursive hand is also characteristic of the wax tablets discovered in a mining district of Dacia containing private legal documents belonging to 131—167 A.D. (*C. I. L.* iii p. 921; Egbert, 382 f)<sup>2</sup>. Lastly, we have examples of the same hand in the tablets recording the business transactions of the Pompeian banker, L. Caecilius Iucundus, mainly for the years 52—62 A.D. (*C. I. L.* iv suppl.; Mau, *Pompeii*, c. 57).

(8) The same hand is found in the 3000 *graffiti* scribbled on the walls of Pompeii. Some of these record the prices of provisions for sale, or the names of members of the Praetorian Guard. Among those of a distinctly literary interest, we find the first word of the poem of Lucretius, *Aeneadum*, or the beginning of the First or Second *Aeneid*, or the line, *Tu, dea, tu praesens nostro succurre labori* (*Aen.* ix 404), or quotations from Propertius (v 5, 47), or Ovid (*Am.* i 8, 77 f; *A. A.* i 475, '*quid pote tan durum saxo aut quid mollius unda | dura tamen molli saxa cavantur aqua*', where the MSS have *quid magis est saxo durum, quid mollius unda*)<sup>3</sup>. In the amphitheatre, as well as in the basilica, the trivialities scribbled on the walls have provoked the quotation of a couplet from an unknown poet:—*admiror, paries, te non cecidisse ruina, | qui tot scriptorum taedia sustineas* (*C. I. L.* iv 1904, 2407; Mau, i 56).

1133. Many of the extant inscriptions are mutilated and fragmentary. Before they can be adequately published, or profitably used as evidence, they often require to be restored by means of conjectural criticism. The first requirement is a completely accurate copy of the original taken by the best mechanical means available. The usual method is that of paper 'squeezes'. These are made by wetting sheets of thick unsized white paper and pressing them into the indentations of the inscription by means of a brush with short stiff bristles. Rubbings may also be made with black lead; and, in the case of very small articles, such as gems, impressions can be taken in wax<sup>4</sup>.

Restoration of  
inscriptions.

In restoring *lacunae*, the general principles of textual criticism are the same in the case of an inscription as in the case of a manuscript. But inscriptions are subject to more rigid rules than literary texts, and leave less room for the exercise of the imagination. From the length of the lines, and the size of the letters, we ascertain the exact number of letters missing. To restore an inscription we are not at liberty to assume any abbreviation we please. Certain words are seldom, if ever, abbreviated, while in others the abbreviated forms are frequent. The restoration of an incomplete inscription may be suggested or confirmed by a more complete inscription on the same subject or by a parallel passage from a classical author.

Inscriptions are the main source of our knowledge on the three following points:—(1) the history and chronological development of the *Roman name* (§ 222); (2) the *Cursus honorum* (§ 360), or sequence of public offices held by senators or equites, the successive titles being carefully recorded either in ascending or in descending order, while both principles may be

<sup>1</sup> Cp. W. S. Fox, *Am. Journ. Philol.* no. 129 (1912), with bibliography.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. § 1140 *infra*.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. Fig. 118, p. 738 *supra*.

<sup>4</sup> Cp. Hübner, *Ueber mechanische Copieen von Inschriften*, 1870, 181; S. Reinach *Conseils aux voyageurs archéologues* (1886), 36—42.

exemplified in two different inscriptions on the same individual (cp. Cagnat, p. 87 f); (3) the *Names and Titles of the Emperors*, and of members of the imperial family. A knowledge of all these points (fully set forth in the manuals) is no necessary part of an introduction to the study of inscriptions; but it is an important aid towards the restoration of *lacunae*; and the same may be said of a knowledge of the customary legal *formulae*. In the case of points (2) and (3), this may be illustrated by Mommsen's restoration of the celebrated inscription recording the career of the younger Pliny (Dessau, i 570).

**1134.** To determine the date of an inscription we have to consider the character of the letters, and especially the spelling of the diphthongs. Thus the forms *-ai* for *-ae*, *-oi* for *-oe*, *-ou* for *-ū*, *-ei* for *-i*, are archaic. The unaspirated consonants, *p*, *c*, *t*, are in general earlier than the aspirated. The omission of the final *s* and *m* ceases about 130 B.C. The final *d* of the ablative fell out of general use soon after 200, though it is retained in the *S. C. de Bacchanalibus* in 186 B.C. (§ 1123). In the nominative and accusative of *o*-stems, the old terminations *-os* and *-om* become *-us* and *-um* (except after *u* and *v*) about 234 B.C. The terminations *-ēs*, *-eīs*, and *-īs* are characteristic of the nominative plural of *o*-stems about 100 B.C. In consonant-stems, the genitive termination *-us* (as in *Venerus*, *Kastorus*) ceases soon after that date. (See esp. Ritschl's *Opusc.* iv 765, and cp. Egbert, p. 407.)

The date is also determined by the subject-matter, by the mention of consuls or other officials, whose date is exactly or approximately known. In imperial inscriptions the details of the titles borne by the emperor are generally conclusive.

**1135.** About 800 A.D. a manuscript collection of 80 inscriptions was made, mainly in Rome, by an unknown pilgrim from Einsiedeln (*C. I. L.* vi p. ix). In the Revival of Learning, Latin inscriptions were collected by Petrarch's friends, Rienzi and Dondi; by Poggio Bracciolini (1380—1459), Ciriaco d'Ancona (in 1424—33), and Felix Felicianus of Verona (1464)<sup>1</sup>; by Pomponius Laetus in Rome (d. 1498), and by Antonio Agostino, archbishop of Tarragona (d. 1586). Local collections were published at Ravenna, Augsburg, Mainz, and Rome (1521). The *Fasti Consulares*, discovered in 1546, were edited by Robortelli, Sigonius and Panvinus in 1555—6. The series of *Corpora*, beginning with that of Apianus (Ingoldstadt, 1534), was continued by those of Martin Smetius (1551 and 1565; ed. Lipsius 1588), Gruter (with Scaliger's *Indices*, 1603, reprinted by Graevius in 1707), Reinesius (1682), R. Fabretti (1699), Gori (1726—43), Doni (ed. Gori, 1731), Gude (ed. 1731), Muratori (1739 f), Maffei (1749) and Donati (1765—75), including Maffei's *ars critica lapidaria*.

Modern criticism began when the forgeries of Pirro Ligorio (d. c. 1586) and others were detected by Maffei, Olivieri, and Marini.

<sup>1</sup> *History of Classical Scholarship*, ii 39—41.

Inscriptions produced solely to support a particular opinion are always liable to suspicion. An inscription supporting the view that *Basilice* is on the site of the Samnian town *Murgantia* is discredited by the illegitimate formation of *populus Murgantius*, and by the unidiomatic use of the demonstrative in *hanc basilicam* (*C. I. L.* ix 147\*). Among modern forgeries are the epitaphs of Paulus Aemilius, and the daughters of Marius and of Cicero, and that of Iulia Alpinula (*Tac. Hist.* i 68; *Childe Harold*, iii 66); the inscriptions from Nennig near Trier, and many of the sling-bolts of Asculum (cp. Hübner's *Ex.* pp. 412–16; Cagnat, 357<sup>3</sup>f; Waltzing, 23–29). An inscription on the Census of Quirinius once supposed to be a forgery is now accepted as genuine (Rushforth, no. 23).

Marini produced a standard work on the *Acta* of the *Fratres Aruales* (1795), and his pupil Borghesi (d. 1860) became the founder of the modern science of Roman Epigraphy. The results of the researches of Marini and others were embodied in the *amplissima collectio* of J. C. Orelli (1828), with additions and indices by Henzen (1856), who, with Mommsen and De Rossi, carried out a plan for a universal *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, according to a scheme laid before the Berlin Academy by Mommsen in 1847. Mommsen's *Inscriptions of the Neapolitan Kingdom* (1852) and of *Helvetia* (1854) were followed in 1863 by the first volume of the great series of the *Corpus Inscriptionum*. The dates and general contents of the several volumes are recorded below.

Standard  
works from  
Marini to  
Mommsen.

Texts etc. in *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* (*C. I. L.*); i, *Inscr. Latinae antiquissimae* (from 490 B.C. to the death of Caesar in 44 B.C.), ed. Mommsen, with *Fasti Consulares*, ed. Henzen, 1863, ed. 2, part I, 1893; ii, Spain, ed. Hübner, 1869; Suppl. 1892; iii, Cyrene, Egypt and Ethiopia, Asia, Greek provinces in Europe, and Illyricum, ed. Mommsen, 2 vols. (with Monumentum Ancyranum and Edict of Diocletian in vol. 2) 1873–7; Suppl. Fasc. i–iv, 1889–1902; iv, *Graffiti* etc. of Pompeii, etc., ed. Zangemeister and R. Schoene, 1871; Suppl., 1898, and (ed. Mau) 1909; v (in two parts), Gallia Cisalpina, including Liguria, Transpadana, Venetia and Histria (Aemilia being reserved for xi), ed. Mommsen, 1872–7<sup>1</sup>; vi, Rome (in six parts), ed. Bormann, Henzen, Hülsen and De Rossi, 1876–1902; vii, Britain, ed. Hübner, 1873; Suppl. in *Eph. Ep.* iii, iv, and by F. Haverfield, in vii, and in *Arch. Journal*; viii, Africa (in two parts), ed. G. Wilmanns, 1881; Suppl. (in three parts), ed. Cagnat, J. Schmidt and Dessau, 1891–1904; ix, Calabria, Apulia, Samnium, Sabini, Picenum, ed. Mommsen, 1883; x (in two parts), (1) Bruttii, Lucania, Campania; (2) Sicilia, Sardinia, ed. Mommsen, 1883; xi (in three parts), (1) Aemilia, Etruria, ed. Bormann, 1888; (2) Umbria, ed. Bormann, 1901; (3) *instrumentum*, ed. Ihm...; xii, Gallia Narbonensis, ed. O. Hirschfeld, 1888; xiii, tres Galliae et duae Germaniae (in six parts), (1) Aquitania et Lugdunensis, 1899; (2) Belgicae, 1904; (3) Germ. Sup. 1905, ed. O. Hirschfeld and Zangemeister; (4) Germ. Inf., ed. Domaszewski etc. 1907; (5) *Instrumentum*, ed. O. Bohn, 1901; (6) do. with *Signacula Medicorum*, ed. Espérandieu, 1906; xiv, Latium Vetus, ed. Dessau, 1887; xv (in two parts), *Instrumentum*, ed. Dressel, 1891–9.

<sup>1</sup> *Supplementa Italica*, ed. Et. Pais, 1884–8.

*Inscr. Christianae* (1) *urbis Romae*, ed. De Rossi, 1857-88; (2) *Hispaniae*, (3) *Britanniae*, ed. Hübner, 1871-6; (4) *der Rheinlande*, ed. F. X. Kraus, 1890, (5) *de la Gaule*, ed. Le Blant, 1892; (6) *der Schweiz*, ed. Egli, 1895.

Additional inscr. published in the *Ephemeris Epigraphica* (1872-), and annually reviewed in Cagnat's *L'Année Epigraphique* (1888 f). Cp. A. Stein on *Römische Epigraphik (Italien, 1893-1906)* in Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, cxliv (1909), iii 157-434.

De Ruggiero, *Dizionario Epigrafico di Antichità Romane*, Rome, 1886-.

Facsimiles, etc., in (1) *Priscae Latinitatis Monumenta Epigraphica (P.L.M.E.)*, ed. Ritschl, Berlin, 1862; Suppl. in *Opusc.* iv, 1878, with Atlas of plates; and (2) *Exempla Scripturae Epigraphicae Latinae a Caesaris dictatoris morte ad aetatem Iustiniani (Ex. or Exempla)*, ed. Hübner, Berlin, 1885, including more than 1200 inscr. with Commentary and complete Introduction; also (3) E. Diehl, *Inscriptiones Latinae* (50 plates), in Lietzmann's *Tabulae*, no. iv, Bonn, 1912.

Selections: (1) J. C. Orelli, *Amplissima Collectio*, Zürich, vols. i, ii, 1828; vol. iii, supplementa and indices, ed. Henzen, 1856; (2) G. Wilmanns, *Exempla*, 2885 inscr. classified, with notes and full indices, Berlin, 1873; (3) John Wordsworth, *Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin*, selections from *C.I.L.* i on pp. 156-250, 266-271, Oxford, 1874; (4) F. D. Allen, *Remnants of Early Latin*, Boston, 1880; (5) Dessau, *Inscr. Selectae*, (8883) classified and annotated, Berlin, vol. i, 1892; ii, 1902-6; (6) G. M. Rushforth, *Latin Historical Inscriptions*, Oxford, 1893; (7) Bücheler, *Carmina Epigraphica*, Teubner text, Leipzig, 1895-7; (8) in Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*, Bonn, 1908-11, E. Diehl, (a) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, (b) *Altlateinische*, (c) *Vulgärlateinische*, (d) *Pompeianische*, (e) *Christliche Inscr.*; F. Richter, *Sacralinschr.*; (9) W. M. Lindsay, *Handbook of Latin Inscr., illustrating the history of the language*, Boston, 1897.

Language: (1) G. N. Olcott, (a) *Word-formation*, Leipzig, 1898; (b) *Thesaurus linguae Latinae epigraphicae*, Rome, 1904-; (2) *Grabeninschriften*, J. E. Church, Munich, 1901; (3) Spain, A. Carnoy, Louvain, ed. 2, 1906; (4) Gaul, J. Pirson, Brussels, 1901; (5) Gallia Narbonensis, pronunciation and orthography, F. Neumann, Trieste, 1897; (6) Africa, Kübler in *Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie*, viii; (7) Etruscan-Latin, Lattes, *ib.*; (8) Final *m*, Diehl, Leipzig, 1899.

History of the study of Latin Epigraphy; (1) Hübner, in Introduction to his *Exempla*, and to his articles in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*; (2) R. de la Blanchère, *Histoire de l'Épigraphie Romaine*, Paris, 1887; (3) J. P. Waltzing, *Recueil général des inscriptions Latines (C.I.L.), et l'Épigraphie Latine depuis 50 ans*, Louvain, 1892.

Manuals, etc.: (1) C. Bone, *Anleitung zum Lesen, Ergänzen und Datieren römischer Inschriften*, Trier, 1881 (elementary); (2) E. Hübner, (a) *Roman Inscriptions*, first printed in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, ed. 9, vol. xiii (nearly 20 columns), London, 1881, revised and abridged by W. M. Lindsay in ed. 11, vol. xiv (16 columns), Cambridge, 1910, (b) Introduction to *Exempla*, 166 columns, folio, 1885, (c) *Römische Epigraphik*, in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, i, 73 pp., Munich, 1886; ed. 2, 95 pp., 1892; (3) R. Cagnat, (a) *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*, Paris, 1886; ed. 2, 436 pp., 1890; ed. 3, 460 pp., 1898; Suppl. 1904; (b) *Inscriptiones*, in Daremberg and Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, v 526 f; (4) J. C. Eglbert, *Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions*, 468 pp., American Book Company, New York, 1896; revised ed. with Suppl. pp. 469-477, 1908; (5) Serafino Ricci, *Epigrafia Latina, trattato elementare, con 65 tavole*, 447 pp., Milan, 1898; (6) O. Marucchi, *Christian Epigraphy*, E. T., Cambridge, 1912.



## IX. 2. PALAEOGRAPHY.

1136. IN tracing the history of the handwriting of any ancient civilised nation, it is evident that we must consider it from two points of view. We have to follow its development as an instrument of communication in the ordinary affairs of life, that is, in a natural use; and we have to examine it in its application to the purposes of literature, that is, in a more or less artificial use. For it may be assumed from general experience that, from the very first, when the necessity for multiplying literary works has arisen, an immediate distinction has ensued between the ordinary handwriting of the day and the form of writing in which those works have to be given to the world. No author would allow his writings to be published in a form which could not be perused with ease. Neatly written copies were essential; and, when once this demand was recognised, the creation of a formal kind of writing suitable for books intended for the market was the natural result.

Duality of  
writing in  
ancient times.

1137. Hence the student of Latin palaeography should always have present in his mind the concurrent existence of two classes of writing: the ordinary cursive hand common to all, and the carefully written book-hand employed by trained scribes for the purposes of literature. Not that the two streams, however, are always kept absolutely distinct. Cursive writing might of course be used, and was frequently used, by scholars in copies made for private study. And again, in composition, the author naturally wrote his ordinary current script. And, on the other hand, a set form of writing or book-hand might be employed at the caprice of a scribe or for some official reason, perhaps, in drawing up a document which more usually would be inscribed in cursive characters. But these are exceptions.

Duality of  
Latin writing.

1138. And yet, while the two classes of handwriting were in concurrent use, the fact must never be lost sight of that both sprang from the same alphabet. The primitive Latin alphabet was composed of letters of a formed though rugged character, which, when written down in words, stood as so many units apart from one another, and only required to be inscribed with care and uniformity to become the letters which we call capitals. On the other hand, the same primitive alphabet, under the pen of the ready writer who sought to express himself with speed, naturally assumed a less exact formation, as strokes were slurred, superfluities were dropped out, angles were curved, and letters were linked together. Thus grew up the cursive form of writing, the natural handwriting of individuals.

Its common  
origin in the  
primitive  
Latin  
alphabet.

The literary or book-hand of Latin palaeography was, in its nature, a constrained form of handwriting, and, as in the case of other kinds of script, there always existed a certain antagonism between it and the natural cursive style. A book-hand,

Changes  
in the  
book-hand.

which in all cases is the outcome of careful elaboration, is at its best at the moment when it has become established. Then the trained scribe writes it with ease and dexterity. It is then not so very far removed, in essentials, from his natural hand. But, let the style be carried on for some time: it gradually becomes less familiar; to the next generation of scribes it becomes imitative. Then the natural hand is apt to break in, and cursive shapes to make their appearance mingled with the more formal characters. Thus the hand degenerates and is finally superseded by a new reformed style which, in its turn, runs its course.

1139. For the history of its development, Latin palaeography is at a disadvantage as compared with Greek palaeography. Several examples of early Greek handwriting employed for literary purposes, as well as a vast number of cursive specimens, have been recovered in Egypt, the fortunate accident of the possession of the country by the Ptolemies having there brought the language of Greece into common use. The Greek literary hand of the latter part of the fourth century B.C. is now known to us. No Latin MS. of a literary nature has yet been recovered which can be placed with certainty before the Christian era. Nor are there extant other examples of Latin writing of an earlier period. Egypt has hitherto yielded but little even of the first century, and not very much of the next following centuries. But the excavations of Pompeii and Herculaneum and the Roman catacombs have put us in possession of a certain amount of material. From the *graffiti* or wall-scribblings on those sites, and especially from the nest of waxed tablets found, in 1875, at Pompeii in the house of the banker L. Caecilius Iucundus, bearing dates of A.D. 15, 27, and 53—62, can be gathered a fair knowledge of the cursive handwritings of the first century, and substantially of the kind of writing which must have been employed by Cicero and Virgil and Horace, and other classical writers of their day, in the composition of their works.

Cursive hand  
of the  
first century.

Of the book-hand of this time, besides a fragment containing part of an oration (*Z. IV.*, Ex. 1, 2), there is an example in the papyrus fragments of a *poem on the Battle of Actium*, from Herculaneum, the period of which must lie between the year 31 B.C., the date of the battle, and A.D. 79, that of the destruction of the city. The writing is in large capital letters of the type called Rustic, that is, letters of a negligent pattern, as compared with the square capitals, the main strokes being more slender, and the cross-strokes short and more or less oblique or waved without finials (Fig. 127).

Book-hand  
of the  
first century.

This character, like the square capitals, was in common use for inscriptions on stone and metal, and was no doubt largely employed as a literary hand for books intended for the market; but it was probably only on rare occasions and for special reasons that it was written, as a literary hand, on such a large scale as in this instance. It is to be seen for example on a small scale in a roll of the First Cohort of Spain when on service in Egypt in A.D. 156 (*Pal. Soc.* ii 105); and it must have been very generally

employed when an exact and formal type of writing was required for any purpose. But it could not have been the only style of the literary hand.

PRÆBERETQUE SUAE SPECTACULI  
QUALIS AD INSTANTIS ACIES CUM  
SIGNATUBAE CLASSESQUE SIMUL  
EST FACIES EA UISA LOCI CUM SAEV.

Fig. 127. Poem on the Battle of Actium. Before A.D. 79<sup>1</sup>.

It was far too cumbersome for general literature; and it can hardly be doubted that the better class of cursive hands, such as are seen in some of the best-written waxed tablets of Pompeii, were moulded into uniformity and served this purpose. We shall meet with the Rustic capitals again at a later period.

1140. Cursive Roman writing of the first century, as we meet with it in the wall-inscriptions and in the early waxed tablets of Pompeii, exhibits interesting varieties of individual hand-writings<sup>2</sup>. It is not improbable that in general character the hand is not very dissimilar to that which had been in vogue for one or two centuries earlier, if we may judge by the comparatively slight changes which passed over it in the course of the next hundred years or more, as shown in the collection of tablets, varying in date from A.D. 131 to 167, which were found at Alburnus Major, the modern Verespatak, in Dacia<sup>3</sup>. The *Pompeian tablets* mainly consist of deeds connected with sales by auction, and tax receipts<sup>4</sup>. A specimen of a few lines selected from one of the best-written documents (no. cxliii) of A.D. 59 shows how, in writing with the stilus on the comparatively stubborn surface of wax, there is a natural tendency to form the letters in disconnected strokes and to employ vertical strokes as much as possible. Thus we see the cross-bar of A indicated by a short vertical stroke, as if dropping out of the open base of the letter; and the vertical two-stroke E and the vertical four-stroke M preferred (Fig. 128).

Cursive hand  
of the  
first century.

<sup>1</sup> *Fragmenta Herculanensia*, ed. Walter Scott, Oxford, 1885, from pl. E: 'præberetque . suae . spectacul[a . tristia . mortis.] | qualis ad instantis . acies . cum [tela . parantur,] | signa tubae . classesque . simul [terrestribus . armis,] | est . facies . ea . uisa . loci . cum saeu[a . coirent.]' etc.

<sup>2</sup> The forms of the alphabetical letters used in these examples are carefully tabulated in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* of the Berlin Academy, vol. iv.

<sup>3</sup> The Dacian tablets are published, with a table of alphabets, in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. iii. This table, as well as that in vol. iv, is reproduced by the Palaeographical Society.

<sup>4</sup> Edited, in 1898, by Prof. Zangemeister as a supplement to *C. I. L.* iv.

In colonis Grospho Grospho  
 Pompeio Gouiano II uir iur.  
 VI idus Iulias  
 Priuatus colonorum coloniae  
 Veneriae Corneliae Pompeianorum  
 scripsi me  
 accepisse ab L. Caecilio Iucundo  
 sestertios mille sescentos  
 sustinens mille sustinens

Fig. 128. Pompeian tablet. A.D. 59<sup>1</sup>.

But, in writing with the pen on the smooth and unresisting surface of

In colonis Grospho Grospho  
 Pompeio Gouiano II uir iur.  
 VI idus Iulias  
 Priuatus colonorum coloniae  
 Veneriae Corneliae Pompeianorum  
 scripsi me  
 accepisse ab L. Caecilio Iucundo  
 sestertios mille sescentos  
 sustinens mille sustinens

Fig. 129. Fragment of Speeches. A.D. 41—54<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The reading is: 'Cn. Pompeio Grospho Grospho | Pompeio Gouiano II uir iur. dic. | VI idus Iulias | Priuatus colonorum coloniae | Veneriae Corneliae Pompeianorum ser[uus] scripsi me | accepisse ab L. Caecilio Iucundo | sestertios mille sescentos'.

<sup>2</sup> The reading is: 'uobis . uidetur . p . c . decernám[us] . ut . etiam] | prólátis . rebus . nis . iúdicibus . n[ecessitas] . iudicandi] | imponátur . qui . intrá . rerum . [agendárum . dies]] incohata . iudicia . non . per[e]gerint . nec] | defuturas . ignoro . fraudes . m[onstrósa] . agentibus] | multas . aduersus . quas . exc[ogitáuimus]' , etc.



papyrus, handwriting naturally becomes more fluent. The action of the hand changes, and the effort of the rapid writer is, not to break up his letters, but to form them as fully as he can without lifting the pen. One of the earliest available examples of Latin writing on papyrus, to which an approximate date can be given, is a *fragment at Berlin containing portions of speeches delivered in the Senate*, ascribed to the reign of Claudius, A.D. 41—54<sup>1</sup>. Here the writing, though still somewhat restrained and admitting but little linking of the letters, is yet of a more flowing type than that of the contemporary tablets and *graffiti*.

1141. Owing to the dearth of material, we are not in a position to trace step by step the development of the Roman cursive hand in the first centuries of our era. Still, even with the few examples at hand, there seems to be reason for conjecture that Latin writing on papyrus passed through phases not very dissimilar to those of Greek writing on the same material. For, when we emerge from the third century, we find an enlarged flowing hand, as seen in the Latin translation of the fables of Babrius in the fragmentary papyrus in the Amherst collection (no. xxvi), ascribed to the third or fourth century; and in a *letter of recommendation* from an Egyptian official, of the fourth century, now at Strassburg<sup>2</sup>. The handwriting of the latter example recalls the large style of Greek cursive of the Byzantine period (Fig. 130).

Its early  
development.




Fig. 130. Official Letter. Fourth century<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Facsimile in F. Steffens, *Lateinische Palaeographie*, taf. 101, ed. 1906.

<sup>2</sup> See *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, iii 2, 168.

<sup>3</sup> The reading is: 'Cum in omnibus bonis benign[itas tua sit praedita tum] | etiam scholasticos et maxime [qui a me cultore tuo hono] | rificentiae tuae traduntur qu[od] honeste respicere uelit] | non dubito domine praedicab[ilis]', etc.

**1142.** From this point the later progress of the Roman cursive writing can be followed through the documents on papyrus from Ravenna, Naples, and other places in Italy, dating from the fifth century, and leading on to the national hands of continental Europe which had their origin in this script. But notice should be taken of certain fragments of Imperial rescripts addressed to Egyptian officials, and ascribed to the fifth century, the writing of which is the Roman cursive cast into an official mould, no doubt that of the Roman chancery of the period<sup>1</sup>.

**1143.** But, while the Roman cursive hand was passing through these changes, the course of development of the literary hand seems to have been in the direction of a modification of capitals. In the earliest extant vellum mss three forms of writing in large letters, or majuscules, are found in use, viz. the Square Capital, the Rustic Capital, and the Uncial hands. Of these we have already seen the Rustic Capital employed as a literary hand in the Actium papyrus (§ 1139). Of the other two, the Square Capital and the fully developed Uncial hands, no examples in early papyri have yet been discovered. Until quite recently there has been nothing to help us to fill the gap in the history of the literary hand between the period of the Herculaneum fragments and that of the vellum mss, that is, for the space of some three centuries. But the recovery at Oxyrhynchus of a fragmentary papyrus containing part of an *epitome of Livy*, of the third century, puts us in possession of a valuable example of a literary hand of that period (Fig. 131). It may be described as occupying a stage on the road towards the fully developed uncials of the vellum mss. Uncial writing is a modification of the Square Capital. As the latter was the style best adapted for inscriptions on stone or metal, so the Uncial hand, a form of writing which avoided angles and preferred curves, was the one most suitable for writing with the reed or pen. Its principal characteristic letters are the curved forms **α δ ε β μ**. The writing of the epitome is composed mainly of letters of the uncial type, but also of a certain number of letters, as *b*, *d*, *m*, *r*, of the minuscule or small character; and thus it may be regarded as an ancestor of a certain class of scripts in mixed-uncials and half-uncials, which are found in the fifth century and onwards. The mixture of majuscule and minuscule forms in this example is of special interest, as it affords an instance of the natural conflict between the formal capitals, whence the uncials are derived, and the ordinary cursive writing of the time which has supplied the small letters, cast in a formal mould suitable

<sup>1</sup> See *Mém. de l'Institut*, xv 399. A table of Latin cursive alphabets, including that of the Rescripts, is given by E. M. Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*. The student will experience no difficulty in following the changes in the formation of the individual letters, excepting in the case of the letter *b*. The transfer of the base loop of this letter from the left side (as it appears in the specimens given in the text above) to the right side, in the course of rapid writing, is a most interesting detail.

for literature. It appears, then, that, at any rate in the third century, the formation of the uncial alphabet out of the square capitals was complete for literary purposes, except for a limited number of letters<sup>1</sup>. At the same time, the contemporary existence also of a fully formed uncial hand, such as is found in the fourth century, is not excluded and may be proved by further discoveries. Of uncial writing, as it appears in vellum MSS, it will be necessary to speak after first describing the other two majuscule scripts.




Fig 131. Epitome of Livy. Third century<sup>2</sup>.

1144. As to Square Capitals, it may be doubted whether any example of such writing on papyrus will ever be recovered; for, although it is a natural inference that this kind of lettering might have been applied, like the rustic pattern, to written literature, as well as to incised inscriptions, it is questionable whether so massive a style could have been conveniently used in writing on a material comparatively so slender as papyrus. It is significant that even on vellum square capital writing is rare, in comparison with the use of the rustic and uncial characters. The only examples of early date consist of a few leaves of a MS of Virgil divided between the Vatican Library and Berlin, attributed to the close of the fourth century; and a few leaves from another MS of the

Rare use of  
Square  
Capitals.

<sup>1</sup> From the occurrence of isolated uncial forms in inscriptions, the period of growth of the uncial hand has been determined to lie between the latter part of the second century and the fourth century. Uncial letters are found, especially in African inscriptions of the third century, with a mixture of minuscules, particularly *b* and *d* (see Hübner, *Exempla scripturae epigraphicae Latinae*, 1885, proleg. xxxviii). The Makter inscription (*Pal. Soc.* ii 49), which is certainly as early as the fourth century, is cut in uncials, with a certain intermixture of small letters.

<sup>2</sup> *New Pal. Soc.* 53, 'sua manu Bonu[m] nobilem occiderat'. | a lanatone cen[sore] senatu motus est]. | uastaita Porcia [facta]. | M. Claudio Marcello [Q. Fabio Labeone cos]. | P. Licini Crassi po[n]tificis maximi | ludis fune(b)ribus'. Here *Bonum* stands for *Boium*; *lanatone* for *M. Catone*; and *uastaita* for *basilica* (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, iv, 1904, p. 97). Cp. Livy, xxxix 42—46. (A fragment of Sallust's *Catilina*, chap. 6, assigned to the fifth century, has since been published, *ib.* vi, 1908, p. 195 f, plate v. The hand is of a 'mixed' type, in which cursive characteristics predominate.)

same poet, of the fourth or fifth century, at St Gall in Switzerland. It almost seems as if the employment of so inconvenient a form of writing, and one which occupied so much space, was reserved for very special occasions, such as the production of a sumptuous volume of the works of some famous author.

**1145.** Being more easily written and being more easily compressed and therefore occupying less space than the square capitals, Rustic Capitals appear to have been employed for literary purposes somewhat extensively in the early period of vellum MSS, if we may judge by the comparatively large number of MSS or portions of MSS in this hand which have survived. Two of the most famous codices in rustic capitals are the *Codex Romanus* and the *Codex Palatinus* of Virgil in the Vatican Library, which are now ascribed to the fifth century. They are remarkable for their bold characters, which resemble more nearly the style of the inscriptions of the first century. But volumes such as these, executed on a magnificent scale, must, like the examples in square capitals, have been exceedingly rare, having doubtless been produced only to gratify some special demand. They would have been of but little use to the working scholar. Of more practical dimensions is the MS known as the *Schedae Vaticanae* of the fourth century, containing portions of the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* of Virgil, and enriched with a series of miniatures of extreme value for the history of early art. And of still greater interest as scholars' books are the *Codex Bezae* of Terence, of the fourth or fifth century, with its many annotations, in the Vatican; and the *Medicean*

ISUSPENSALOCIS EXPLORAT ROBORA FUMUS.  
 POSSUM ALIQUANTULUM ET REFUGIUM TENUISSQ. PIGET COGNOSCERE CURAS.  
 AREA CUM PRIMIS INGENGIIS CYLINDRO. QUANDOQUE TENDAM MANU ET CRETAE SOLIDANDA TENACI.  
 NE SUBEANT HERBAE NEU PULUERE VICTA FATISCANT.  
 TUM VARIAE INLUANT PESTES SAepe EXIGUUS MUS  
 SUB TERRIS POSUIT DOMOS ATQUE HORREA FECIT

Fig. 132. The Medicean Virgil. Before A.D. 494<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Georgics*, i 175—182, 'et suspensa focis explorat robora fumus. | possum multa tibi veterum praecepta referre. | ni refugis tenuisque piget cognoscere curas. | area cum primis ingenti aequanda cylindro. | et uertenda manu et creta solidanda tenaci. | ne subeant herbae. neu puluere uicta fatiscant. | tum variae inluant pestes. saepe exiguus mus | sub terris. posuitque domos atque horrea fecit |'.



*Virgil*, at Florence, which was read and corrected by the 'consul ordinarius' Asterius, who held office in the year 494. The delicate character of the writing of this last MS cannot be conveyed quite satisfactorily by a mechanical facsimile, and allowance must be made for slight thickening of the strokes in the specimen here given (Fig. 132).

Rustic capitals survived as a recognised book-hand, but of an artificial character, at all events until the sixth century, the period assigned to the handsome MS of Prudentius in Paris, all later examples being quite decadent and imitative. The best known instance of its employment in the last stage of its existence, for an entire volume, is that of the Utrecht Psalter, a palpable copy, made about the year 800, of an older MS, and reproducing the rustic capital writing of the archetype apparently as the best method of maintaining the exact relative positions of text and drawings. There was indeed, by this time, no practical reason for continuing the use of rustic capitals; the less cumbersome, but still not altogether convenient uncial hand having been in full use for some centuries.

1146. At the head of the classical MSS in Uncial characters stand the palimpsest fragments of Cicero's *Republic* in the Vatican Uncial MSS. Library, which are placed in the fourth century. Written in a large and massive style, the MS, in its original state, must have formed a large volume which, like the great *codices* of Virgil already noticed, was presumably an *édition de luxe* on a scale which could not have been often repeated. The 'Vercelli Gospels' is another uncial MS, which is as early as the fourth century. It is to be observed that the uncial alphabet in these early vellum MSS is now fully developed, each letter having its




Fig. 133. Livy (Vienna MS). Fifth century<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Lib. xlii, *ad fin.*, '(Numidis)que hiberna in proximis Tessalis urbibus distribuit et partem exercitus | ita per totam Tessaliam diuisit ut et hibernam commodam omnes haberent | et praesidio urbibus essent. Q. Mucium legatum cum duobus milibus ad optinendam Ambraciam misit Graecarum ciuitatum sociis omnes prae(ter Achaeos dimisit consul).


prototype in the corresponding letter of the square capital alphabet. In the fifth and sixth centuries the Uncial hand was the leading character for the chief MSS; and in those two hundred years it was at its best. The scribes wrote it naturally and with the facility of constant practice. Two of the most celebrated classical *codices* of Latin literature of the fifth century are those of Livy in Paris and in Vienna, both of them beautifully written but the latter in smaller characters than the other. The *Vienna MS* is conjectured to have belonged to the English monk, Suitbert or Suiberht, one of the apostles to the Frisians, who became their bishop about the year 693 (Fig. 133).

In the seventh century uncial writing betrays artificiality; it was then passing out of the natural stage familiar to the scribes. In the eighth century it degenerated very rapidly, appearing in MSS of that age either as a rough, badly formed script, or, when carefully written, as merely imitative. No style of handwriting could maintain its purity and vigour for many hundreds of years, and, every thing considered, it is remarkable that the uncial hand should have had so long a career, seeing that there was in existence at least one other form of handwriting which could be far more expeditiously written and within less space, and which was used concurrently with it, as a literary hand, for a considerable period. The script referred to is that which was developed from the blending of the uncial and minuscule, or formal cursive, styles, and to which the name of Half-uncial or Roman Half-uncial has been given.

**1147.** But, before it is considered, a less perfect form of writing, which may be regarded as preliminary to it, must be noticed. This is a script of mixed uncials and minuscules. The mingling of the two streams of handwriting, namely, literary forms, and ordinary cursive forms, had been already in action before the full development of the literary uncial of the vellum MSS. It appears in a rudimentary state in a fragment from Herculaneum (*Exempla*, tab. 2 *b*) where some of the more cursive forms of the tablets are mixed with the rustic capitals. It appears in the epitome of Livy of the third century cited above (§ 1143); and, from the regularity and ease with which the text in this instance is inscribed, it may be assumed that this class of writing, in mixed characters, had been fully practised for some time, perhaps for at least a century earlier. That this same mixed hand was also employed in the next following centuries, is proved by the fact that it is found in common use in certain MSS of the fifth and sixth centuries. It is often met with in marginal notes; and its full employment in actual texts is a conspicuous feature in the fragmentary MS of Gaius at Verona, ascribed to the fifth century, and in certain parts of the great *codex* of Justinian's *Pandects* at Florence, which may fall within the latter part of the sixth century (Fig. 134). From the examples which have survived of this mixed style of writing, it appears that secular MSS, such as those relating to law and grammar, were not subject in their production to the same strict calligraphic rules as MSS

Mixed uncial  
and minuscule  
script.

for church use or of a specially sumptuous character. In writing for the scholar, rather than for the public reader or the book-collector, a certain freedom was allowed, and the mixed style which has been described was a sufficient and practical hand for text-books and working copies of general literature.



POMPONIVS LIBRO SEXTO AD Sabinum  
 si ita legatum fuerit uni ex heredi-  
 bus quod mihi debet, praecipito of-  
 ficio iudicis familiae heriscundae  
 continetur, ne ab eo coheredes exi-  
 gant, nam etsi quod alius deberet praecipere  
 unus iussus fuerit officio  
 iudicis actiones ei praestari debebunt  
 pro portione coheredis.

Fig. 134. Florentine Pandects. Sixth century<sup>1</sup>.

1148. But the mixed hand, although partaking something of the nature of the Half-uncial hand, was not actually that form of writing.

For the latter was not only a mingling of the two scripts, Half-uncial  
script. uncials and minuscules, but also a blending of them, the uncial element yielding more or less to the minuscule influence, while the minuscule element was reacted upon by the uncial sentiment of roundness and sweeping curves. Thus, in its full development, the Roman Half-uncial hand, were it not for a few lingering pure uncial forms, might equally well be described as a rounded large-type minuscule hand. It has, in fact, been also called the prae-Carolingian minuscule. The half-uncial hand in this state of development is found in the fifth century in the marginal scholia of the Bembe Terence; as a literary hand for texts, it appears in the palimpsest *Fasti Consulares* of the years 487—494, at Verona; in the fine ms of St Hilary de Trinitate in the archives of St Peter's in Rome, written before the year 509—510; and in an increasing number of mss of the sixth and seventh centuries, specimen facsimiles of which may be seen in the *Exempla* of Zangemeister and Wattenbach, and in the plates issued by the Palaeographical Society. It had so important

<sup>1</sup> From Facsimile ed. published by the *Commissione Ministeriale*, Florence, 1902 f: Digest, x 2, 42, 'Pomponius libro sexto ad Sabinum | si ita legatum fuerit uni ex heredi|bus quod mihi debet, praecipito of|ficio iudicis familiae heriscundae | con-|tinetur, ne ab eo coheredes exigant; nam etsi quod alius deberet praecipere unus iussus fuerit, officio | iudicis, actiones ei praestari debebunt | pro portione coheredis'.

an influence on the literary book-hands of mediaeval Europe, that it is desirable that a specimen should be placed before the student, which is taken from the most beautifully executed half-uncial ms, a *Biblical commentary in the monastery of Monte Cassino*, written before the year 569.

aboleret. natus er go  
ut quae primum fecer  
crearet qui aperire no  
morta ut semper in

Fig. 135. Biblical commentary, Monte Cassino. Before A.D. 569<sup>1</sup>.

We have seen, then, that at a comparatively early date the contest for supremacy between the formal majuscules and the cursive minuscules, as a medium for the expression of literary works, had practically ended in a victory for the latter: a result which was certain; simple and more easily handled methods being naturally preferred to those which, though more stately, are also more cumbersome. Not that the establishment of the half-uncial hand actually drove the uncial hand out of the field. The latter still had a career before it, but, as we have seen, it was chiefly maintained in practice for church books and special works, and in the end was finally extinguished by a new phase of minuscule writing.

1149. We have now arrived at the point when we must examine the rise and development of the national hands of Western Europe.

National  
hands.


While the Roman Empire was the great central power dominating her colonies and conquests, the Roman script, however far apart the countries in which it was employed, remained practically one and the same. But when the great empire was broken and independent nationalities arose from its ruins and advanced upon independent paths in civilisation, the handwriting which they had inherited from their Roman masters gradually assumed distinctive characters and took the national complexions of the several countries where it was used; unless from some particular cause the continuity of the effects of the Roman occupation was disturbed, as it was in Britain by the Saxon invasion. On the continent of Western Europe, in Gaul, in Spain, and in Italy, the Roman cursive writing of everyday life had become the common script; and it remained the framework on which the national hands of those countries developed. Thus arose the so-called Lombardic hand of Italy, the Visigothic hand of Spain, and the Merovingian and subsequently

<sup>1</sup> Wattenbach and Zangemeister, *Ex.* 53; E. M. Thompson's *Palaeography*, p. 202, ed. 1906; 'aboleret, natus ergo e— | ut quae primum fecer[at]— | crearet quia per erro[rem]— | mortua ut semper in—'.



Carolingian hand of the Frankish Empire. But, naturally, a large space of time had to be traversed before the distinctive characteristics had become finally determined. The modifications of a common hand sufficiently accentuated to mark the idiosyncrasies of different nationalities must, in the nature of things, be of slow growth. The earliest charters of the three national divisions, dating generally from the seventh century, still remained fairly close to each other in the general style of their scripts. It was in the book-hands, elaborated from this cursive character, that the lines of demarcation became more clearly defined. At the same time it is obvious that during the growth of the national literary hands, all emanating from one source, there must have been many examples of a mixed or half developed style which it would have been difficult to assign decisively to one or other of the three divisions. This in fact is the case with several of the MSS which have survived. For the difference between a MS written in Frankland and a MS written in Northern Italy is not always so strongly marked as to enable us to call the one decidedly Merovingian, or the other decidedly Lombardic in its style.

1150. The national handwriting of Italy founded on the Roman cursive did not develop on the same lines throughout the country. Lombardic. Charlemagne's conquest of Northern Italy introduced new influences and these checked the independent development of the Lombardic hand, the MSS of that district exhibiting the mixed character to which has been given the name of Franco-Lombardic. But in the Lombard duchies of the south it had free scope, and reached full growth as a national hand in such centres as the monasteries of Monte Cassino near Naples and La Cava near Salerno. The literary Lombardic hand was



Toto hoc in genere pugne. cum sub oculis omnium  
 cum est. nostros propter gravitatem armorum. quod neque  
 signis discedere audent. minus aptos esse ad  
 magno cum periculo prelio dimicasse. propterea quod  
 illi etiam consulto plerumque cederent. et cum  
 paulum ab legionibus nostros removissent, etc.

Fig. 136. Caesar, Laurentian Library. Eleventh century<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Chatelain, *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, xlix. 'Toto hoc in genere pugne, cum sub oculis omnium [ac pro castris dimicaretur, intellec]tum est nostros propter gravitatem armorum. quod neque [insequi cedentes possent neque ab] | signis discedere audent. | minus aptos esse ad [huius generis hostem, equites autem] | magno cum periculo prelio dimicare. | propterea quod illi etiam consulto plerumque cede]rent. et cum paulum ab legionibus nostros removissent', etc. *De Bell. Gall.* v 16.

in full activity from the ninth to the thirteenth century, reaching its climax in the eleventh century. Lombardic writing cast into the restraining mould of a book-hand developed an affected style of calligraphy. At an early period it shows a tendency to form the letters with strongly contrasting fine and heavy strokes, the scribe turning the point of the pen inwards and making the obliquely-written members of the letters heavy. This style of ornamental finish, when carried to an extreme, imparted to the Lombardic literary hand that peculiar appearance which has gained for it the name of *broken Lombardic*. The preceding specimen of Lombardic writing of the eleventh century is taken from a MS of Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*, etc., in the *Laurentian Library at Florence* (Fig. 136).

**1151.** The so-called Visigothic hand of Spain ran a course very similar to that of the Lombardic hand in Italy. It developed a Visigothic. book-hand of distinctive character, which was fully established in the eighth and ninth centuries and continued in use down to the twelfth century. It is difficult to describe varieties in the forms of the letters of the national hands under discussion; they can only be followed with advantage by consulting the MSS themselves or facsimiles. It may be observed, however, that those particular letters of the Roman cursive alphabet which were subject to changes in their shapes under special conditions, such as position in the line of writing or combination with other letters, assumed in the national hands more or less characteristic forms and variations. For example, the letters *a*, *e*, and *t*, and to some extent *u*, might be selected as specially liable to modifications. In a few instances a particular form of letter distinctively belongs to one or other of the national hands. Thus the double-c form of *a* in Lombardic, the narrow open *a* and the occasional sickle-shaped *u* in Merovingian, and the sickle-shaped *g* in Visigothic, are characteristic. Visigothic MSS are also peculiar in using an abbreviated form for *per*, which in other hands represents *pro*; and in writing *quum* for the conjunction, which is almost invariably written as *cum* in other scripts.

**1152.** But, while the Lombardic and Visigothic hands were restricted to a circumscribed career and were destined to be finally extinguished, the Frankish hand which has been styled Merovingian. Merovingian was to have a wide influence and to result in a script which was to supersede all the national hands of Western Europe. To produce the Merovingian style the Roman cursive was subjected to a lateral compression and cast into a serried, cramped hand, which is sometimes very difficult to decipher, the strokes slender and the heads and tails of long letters much exaggerated. This kind of writing may be seen in the diplomas of the Merovingian kings. But it was adapted also, as early as the seventh century, to the requirements of literature in the form of a book-hand closely compressed in the same manner. The best specimens of this book-hand are really good examples of calligraphy; and it is interesting to notice in them already that thickening or clubbing of the

main strokes of tall letters *b*, *d*, *h*, *l*, which is afterwards such a marked feature in the Carolingian hand of the ninth century. But this was not the only class of book-hand, derived from the Roman cursive, which obtained within the wide limits of the Frankish Empire. Other hands there were of varying types, but all interrelated, crossing and recrossing each other and in many instances showing affinities with the Lombardic type. But it must not be forgotten that, with all this variety of handwritings of minuscule type in the field, there was still a corrective force at work. The uncial hand and the half-uncial hand were still literary hands to be accounted for; and, as time proceeds, the influence of the half-uncial hand in particular upon the less carefully formed and often rugged styles, to be met with in Frankish mss of the eighth century, becomes more apparent. The later examples of that century continue to show an advance towards the more restrained style which was to result in the practical and enduring Carolingian minuscule hand.

1153. While, on the continent of Western Europe, the national hands were developing in uninterrupted and natural progress from the Roman cursive, the national script of Ireland, and thence of Britain, was derived from another branch of Roman writing, namely the Half-uncial. Roman civilisation in Britain was extinguished by the Saxon invasion, and with it the Roman current script which had been employed here, as it was elsewhere within the limits of the Roman Empire, and which, if it had not thus been cut short, would have developed, after the withdrawal of the Roman garrison, into a national hand, even as it developed in Frankland and in Spain and in Italy. Whatever may have been the class or classes of mss, which St Augustine and the Roman missionaries brought with them or imported into England, no national form of handwriting was evolved from them. That those mss were written in uncials and half-uncials, or mixed characters, the ordinary literary hands of Italy, may be assumed. But uncial writing was never received with favour in these islands. Scarcely any examples written by native scribes have descended to us; and others, such as the well-known *Codex Amiatinus* of the Bible, which was written in the north of England at the close of the seventh century, were the work of Italian scribes who had been brought thither. Still there remained the half-uncial and mixed hands in the mss which had been imported, and from which a national hand might have been directly constructed; and, in the light of what actually took place, we are justified in conjecturing that, had no other influence intervened, those hands would almost certainly have served as patterns for a national script in England. There are reasons, however, which may sufficiently explain why this was not the case. In the first place, the country was scarcely in a condition for the peaceful development of learning; next, for the foreign missionaries and their scholars the literary book-hands of the imported mss were sufficient; and, best reason of all, a native handwriting had already been created in Ireland and was making its way into England from the north.

The national  
script of the  
British isles.

**1154.** The foundation of the early Church in Ireland and the consequent spread of civilisation in the country naturally led to the cultivation of literature and the development of a national school of writing. That Ireland modelled her national script on the Roman half-uncial there can be no doubt whatever. The Roman cursive hand was probably practically unknown. Why the Roman uncial hand was apparently never employed, it is difficult to explain. It is incredible that no uncial MSS ever made their way into Ireland; the existence of the large number of extant MSS in this form of writing is sufficient proof of the widespread use of the uncial hand in literature. And yet the fact remains, that no instance of an uncial MS of Irish origin is known. But the explanation of this fact is perhaps not altogether beyond conjecture. Both the uncial and the half-uncial hands were foreign hands, imported into the country ready-made and in full growth. The native scholars who first had to learn to write, and who had to choose between two styles, would naturally make choice of the one which would be most useful and the simplest for ordinary purposes. There could be no question as to which of the two styles would best answer these requirements. The Irish scribe adopted the Roman half-uncial script; and then, with his innate sense of beauty of form, he produced from it the handsome literary hand which culminated in the native half-uncial writing, as seen in perfection in the Book of Kells and in other contemporary MSS of the latter part of the seventh century. But the round half-uncial literary hand thus moulded was too elaborate an instrument for the ordinary uses of life. It was necessary also to provide a script which should serve all the duties of a current hand. Therefore, taking the same model, the Roman half-uncial, the Irish scribe adapted it to commoner uses, and, writing the letters more negligently, he evolved the compact pointed minuscule hand which became the current form of handwriting of the country, and which again, in its turn, was, in course of time, also moulded into a book-hand and eventually superseded the half-uncial. Isolated as Ireland became and little disturbed by external influences, the national script grew stereotyped and passed from generation to generation and from century to century with so little change as to become almost the despair of palaeographers. To fix the periods of Irish MSS is always more or less difficult. The old forms of the letters remained; and even at the present day the hand which the Irish scholar writes differs but little in the lettering from the pointed minuscule hand of the middle ages.

**1155.** It is the influence which the Irish national hand has had on the scripts of other countries that gives it its important position in the history of Latin Palaeography. Britain borrowed it *en bloc*; and, in the early middle ages, the Irish missionaries who spread over the continent of Europe and who there became the founders of so many great religious houses, carried their native script with them. Thus, at such centres as Luxeuil in France, Würzburg in Germany,

Influence  
of the  
Irish script.



St Gall in Switzerland, and Bobbio in Italy, Irish writing flourished and MSS in the Irish hand multiplied. At first, such MSS were true examples of the Irish script, and there would have been no distinction between them and the codices actually written in Ireland. But, as was to be expected, the script, thus employed in isolated foreign places, gradually deteriorated, as the bonds of connexion with its native land relaxed and as the native Irish monks died off. In the end it became lifeless and imitative.

1156. To return to Britain. Notice has been taken above of the introduction of MSS into the southern part of the island by the Roman missionaries, and reasons have been suggested why a national hand was not developed from those sources.

English  
script.

Still it is to the north of Britain that we must look for the cradle of the English script, which, at first, was in fact the Irish script transplanted to English soil. St Columba's settlement in Iona brought the Irish national handwriting into Northern Britain; and in the year 634 the Irish missionary Aidan, coming thence, founded the see of Lindisfarne in Northumberland, which became a centre of civilisation and learning, and where the imported script flourished and produced many noble MSS. The *Lindisfarne Gospels* (or *Durham Book*), now in the British Museum, which is said to have been written by bishop Eadfrith about the year 700, is the most notable extant example of the English half-uncial hand founded on the Irish script of the same class, and differing but little from it. Still, there is a difference. An English national character soon impressed itself upon the imported hand and, expanding under more favourable conditions, the writing assumed the graceful style which marks so much of the English script before the Norman Conquest, and which, we believe, had its influence on the national hand which developed after that great political event.

1157. That England also borrowed the Irish pointed minuscule hand is quite evident. The resemblance between the English and Irish minuscule is too close to admit of doubt. That hand certainly existed in Ireland in the seventh century; it probably had already been formed much earlier. It is seen in certain passages of the Book of Kells, and it must have been the common form of handwriting in use among the educated. Once introduced into Northern England, it rapidly spread through the country. By the eighth century, it had been cast into a set form to serve as a literary hand, of a fine ample type, such as is seen in the copy of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* in the Cambridge University Library. As time passes, the hand becomes subject to more lateral compression, the letters grow narrow and the strokes finer. In the ninth century a very delicate pointed cursive hand is found in common use. The accompanying specimen from a *Leiden MS of Pliny's Natural History*<sup>1</sup> shows the pointed hand as it was cast for literary uses in the ninth century, with the colophon and note at the foot written in the delicate cursive just referred to (Fig. 137).

<sup>1</sup> Chatelain, *Pal. Class. Lat.*, cxxxviii.

Extant English charters and mss afford sufficient material even to give an idea of the varieties which the national cursive minuscule script assumed in different parts of the land. The finest style appears generally to have




Fig. 137. Leiden MS of Pliny. Ninth century<sup>1</sup>. See previous page.

flourished in Mercia, many of the early charters of that kingdom being of a very elegant type of penmanship. The Mercian hand seems also to have had some influence on the calligraphy of Kent. And, in contrast, a curiously rough and ungainly handwriting is characteristic of Wessex.

1158. The English literary minuscule hand undergoes considerable change in the course of the tenth century: a certain squareness of character begins to prevail, and the delicate pointed style of the previous century disappears. This change is no doubt to be attributed, at all events in a large degree, to foreign influence. The Carolingian minuscule hand from France was beginning to make its way into England and, under certain conditions, to usurp the place of the native script. Its simpler and more orderly mould certainly had a restraining influence on the national hand. This influence becomes more obvious in the eleventh century, when the squareness of character was still more emphasised and when the sentiment of the foreign style becomes still more apparent. The Norman Conquest brought the literary hand of England into line with that of the continent.

1159. In Latin classical studies an intimate acquaintance with the changes which took place in the handwriting of mss of the Frankish empire,

<sup>1</sup> iv 122, (sed certior mensura)...Germaniae ab iisde[m] Alpibus dirigitur xii (for xū i.e. xv) xliii (sc. milibus passuum). hinc deinde Affrica atque Assia dicuntur.—C. Plini Secundi Naturae Historiae liber IIII explicit. Incipit liber u (i.e. v) feliciter.—feliciter Iunius Laurentius relecti.

consequent on the reforms of Charlemagne, is practically of very great value. The large number of extant classical mss, written in France and Western Germany during the ninth and tenth centuries, is remarkable and bears witness to the widespread study of Latin classical authors which resulted from the revival of learning under the great Frankish emperor. While, among the earlier extant mss written in the national hands which have been under discussion, classical examples are very rare, as soon as the threshold of the ninth century is crossed and we are in presence of the new Carolingian script, they may soon be counted in scores. The part which the Englishman Alcuin of York took in this advancement of learning is well known. For our present purpose it is important, to remember that he became abbot of the great monastery of St Martin at Tours, and that that house was one of the chief centres from which issued a wonderful series of mss written in the reformed hand. We have seen above how the rough minuscule hands of the Frankish Empire had been gradually shaping themselves in the course of the latter part of the eighth century into a passably useful book-hand, influenced materially by the Roman half-uncial writing which had been so long employed for literary purposes. It is hardly assuming too much if we give credit to the sense of beauty in handwriting, which Alcuin must have acquired from his familiarity with the fine bold half-uncial hand of his own country, as a factor in the moulding of the new Carolingian minuscule script. Taking as their models the finest examples of the Roman half-uncial writing of the earlier centuries, such as the one illustrated in Fig. 135, the scribes of the new school worked out, first, a script of a broad and rather ornamental character which is found in the more conspicuous places in their mss, as, for example, in prefaces and introductory passages, where the modern printer would, for the same reason of marking a distinction, employ a larger type than that of the ordinary text. But this style was rather an affected archaistic one than an advance towards the desired reform. The rough hands in use, it is to be remembered, were founded on the minuscule character; the new hand for practical literary purposes must be a minuscule hand. There was no failure. A beautiful and simple hand was evolved. That its beauty and simplicity were real and lasting is proved by the fact that the Roman type which we use to this day was the outcome of this reformed hand.

The Caro-  
lingian reform.

**1160.** The importance attaching to a knowledge of the Carolingian minuscule literary script justifies a closer examination of its construction and of the changes it underwent in the course of the two hundred years succeeding the date of its establishment, as shown in the mss. The result of its general adoption in the different countries of Western Europe will be described afterwards. Taking the best written examples as a standard the Carolingian minuscule hand may be described as a form of writing showing a well-balanced contrast of light and heavy strokes. This contrast

Changes in the  
Carolingian  
Minuscule  
in ninth  
and tenth  
centuries.

is accentuated by the club-like thickening of the upright limbs of letters rising above the line, *b, d, h, l*, which imparts an air of handsome solidity to the text. The same effect was noticed above in the calligraphically written Merovingian book-hand of the seventh century and later. The general formation of the letters is that of a round hand. Certain letters may be regarded as test-letters. The letter *a*, which is generally of the closed type, as in modern print, appears also in the mss of the ninth century not uncommonly in the open *u* form. This of course is only a survival of the open letter of the Roman cursive which descended to the Merovingian script: an instance of the persistent conservatism which is constantly asserting itself in every branch of palaeography. So again, the letter *g* in the ninth century is frequently written with both bows open, like the numeral 3: the origin of which may be easily traced from the Roman minuscule letter as seen in the Pompeian *graffiti* and tablets. Another survival of the Roman cursive hand is the high-shouldered *r*, which occasionally appears thrusting itself up above the line, when conjoined with a following *t*: not infrequently a stumbling-block to the unwary scribe, owing to its resemblance to the long *s* in the same conjunction (*ft*). In the tenth century there is a falling-off in the accuracy

ut peripateticus ille dicitur phor  
mio quom<sup>t</sup> annibal cartha  
gini expulsus ephesū ad an  
tiochū uenisset. exui proque eo  
quod eius nomen erat magna apud omnes  
gloria inuitatus esset ab hospiti  
bus suis. ut eū quē dixisset uellet  
audiret, quomque is se non nolle  
dixisset. locutus ē dicitur homo co  
piosus aliquot horas de imperii  
officio et de militari

Fig. 138. Cicero de Oratore<sup>1</sup>. Perhaps middle of ninth century.

<sup>1</sup> ii 75, 'ut Peripateticus ille dicitur Phormio quom (altered into *cum*) Hannibal Carthagine expulsus Ephesum ad Antiochum uenisset.' exui (for *exul*) proque eo | quod eius nomen erat magna apud omnes | gloria inuitatus esset ab hospitibus suis. ut eum quem dixi si uellet | audiret. quomque (altered into *cumque*) is se non nolle | dixisset. locutus esse dicitur homo copiosus aliquot horas de imperii officio et de (omni) re militari'.



and grace and solidity of the writing; the strokes in general are more meagre, the stems of the tall letters are fined down and are no longer club-thickened, the bodies of the letters are squarer. The open *a* is only occasional; the upper bow of *g* is closed. But the exact chronological limits of these changes must not be too rigidly defined; there must always be a shifting of the lines of demarcation; allowance must be made for local and personal and other influences. Even in the ninth century, local character begins to show itself within the boundaries of the Frankish Empire. Even then the script of MSS written in Germany begins to assume that rather feeble, stiff, and awkward character, with a slope to the right, which afterwards became the leading feature of the German hands. The lack of grace and the rather unfinished appearance of early German MSS tend to cause a difficulty in assigning them to their true periods. As a specimen of the minuscule book-hand of perhaps the middle of the ninth century, a few lines are selected from the *Harleian MS* (no. 2736) of *Cicero de Oratore*, which appears to have belonged to the monastery of Cormery in the diocese of Tours<sup>1</sup>.

**1161.** In the eleventh century the Carolingian minuscule hand departs still further from its original beauty of form, the letters become still squarer, thinner in stroke and generally more closely packed. But by this time it had passed far beyond the boundaries of the country of its origin. In England we have seen it in practice, even in the tenth century, by the side of the native script. On the continent its influence showed itself in the more restrained styles of the national hands of Spain and Italy, and in those countries it gradually superseded them. Its practical simplicity assured its final acceptance everywhere in Western Europe. But now we have a repetition of what had come to pass earlier in the history of palaeography. We have a second course of development of national handwritings. As the old Roman hands, the cursive and the half-uncial, had formed the bases of the old national hands; so the Carolingian minuscule becomes the basis of the national hands of the later Middle Ages in Western Europe. With the eleventh century, these national hands may be said to have already become defined and to be clearly distinguishable from each other by the stamp of national character which they severally bear. But, while they thus diverged in characteristics, the general lines of development on which they moved from century to century were uniform. This, indeed, could not be otherwise, now that common intercourse and common interchange of ideas between the different nations were so generally established. From this point, then, it will be sufficient to follow the course of development of the western European literary hands from century to century, at the same time noticing any special peculiarities attaching to the individual scripts. As a preliminary, however,

Changes in  
the eleventh  
century.

<sup>1</sup> This MS is one of those in which the letter *h* is occasionally indicated, in the corrector's hand, by the Greek square breathing. It is seen in the second line of the specimen above, supplying the aspirate to the word *annibal*.

it should be stated that the older national hands, the Visigothic of Spain and the Lombardic of Italy, are now disregarded, although they still lingered on for a time before they were entirely displaced by the new script. At the moment we are concerned only with the national hands arising out of the Carolingian minuscule.

**1162.** The general style of these European hands in the eleventh century shows a great advance. The words of the text are more regularly separated from one another, and abbreviations and contractions are more systematic. There is a sense of transition, a sentiment of the approach of a development towards modernness. This impression is difficult to define in words. But, by placing a MS of the tenth century and one of the twelfth century side by side, the marked difference of their styles is best appreciated, showing how great was the change that passed over these scripts in the interval.

**1163.** The twelfth century is the finest period in the history of the later national hands of the Middle Ages. It was an age when the arts in general flourished on an ample scale. In the domain of palaeography, large volumes written in large scripts and adorned with initials and borders of bold design were produced in numbers. At no other period does the scribe seem to have taken more pleasure in his art and to have had a stronger sense of the beauty of form of which penmanship is capable. Perfect symmetry of letters, marvellous uniformity in structure, sustained contrast of the light and heavy strokes, and unerring accuracy of the practised hand, are all present in the best examples. The script has entirely thrown off the old-face (to use a modern printer's expression) of the earlier hands, and has assumed the modern cast which has been eventually perpetuated by the printing press. The sense of ornament, which contributes so much to the formation of the letters, extends itself also to the marks of abbreviation and contraction, which are inscribed with uniform accuracy. The mark of general abbreviation is now a short up-turned and gracefully formed curve, so characteristic of the twelfth century that its presence is not infrequently an assistance in fixing the period of the MS in which it appears. It is to be understood that these remarks apply especially to those MSS which were written with a view to calligraphy. Besides them there were, of course, large numbers of texts produced for the ordinary use of scholars in far less ornamental forms of writing. The faculty of identifying the nationalities of these several hands can only be acquired by experience. It may, however, be of assistance to the student to warn him that, in the case of MSS of this period written in Germany, there is a tendency to maintain an archaic style, scribes who worked in remote places beyond the immediate influence of newer ideas being liable to practise an old-pattern script which had been superseded elsewhere.

**1164.** In no country was a more graceful hand written in the twelfth century than in England. At certain centres, especially in the scriptoria

of great monastic houses, calligraphy was practised as a fine art; and the handwriting peculiar to different monasteries may sometimes be recognised. A specimen is here given from a *MS of Suetonius*<sup>1</sup> written, at the close of the century, in St Alban's Abbey, as there is good reason to believe: a typical example of the carefully formed hand in use for general literature. This MS has been selected as an illustration of the later style of the twelfth century, when the larger scale of the earlier MSS was verging towards the close-packed script of the thirteenth century.

Corneliū consularē dolabellā & triūphalē uirū repetundarū postula  
dū secedē statuit: & ad declinandā inuidiā. & ut potiū & requiē ap  
clarissimo dicendi magistro opam daret. Huc dū hiberni iā mensib  
pharmacussā insulā a pāonib; capē est. mansitq; apd eos n̄ s̄n sumē  
xl. dies. cū uno medico & cubiculariis duob; Nam comes seruosq; r

Fig. 139. Suetonius<sup>2</sup>. End of the twelfth century.

**1165.** The change from the style of the twelfth century to that of the thirteenth century is extreme. The large folio so typical of the former shrinks to the pocket volume of the latter. The ample handwriting of the earlier period is exchanged for a serried small-scale script. The ever-increasing numbers of MSS which were now being produced demanded an economy of material. Contractions and abbreviations grow numerous. The bold designs of the miniatures and initials and borders of the twelfth century vanish before the precise and delicate art of the new century, which is the age of minute exactness, often carried to exquisite perfection. The numerous extant MSS of this period bear testimony to an immense literary activity, and, although a great variety of handwritings is displayed in these volumes, yet the rigid character which so strongly marks all hands of the thirteenth century is never relaxed.

**1166.** With regard to the distinctions between the national hands of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it is to be observed that the MSS of England, France, and the Low Countries bear a considerable resemblance to each other, so that it is not always easy to discriminate between the more formally written examples, such as biblical and liturgical books, of

The thirteenth century.

Distinctions between the national hands in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

<sup>1</sup> British Museum, Royal MS 15 C. iv.

<sup>2</sup> *Julius Caesar*, 3, 'Cornelium consularē Dolabellam et triumphalē uirū repetundarū postulat[uit absoluteque Ro]dum secedere statuit. et ad declinandam inuidiam. et ut per otium et requiem Ap[ollonio Moloni tum] | clarissimo dicendi magistro operam daret. Huc dum hiberni iam mensibus [trahit circa] | Pharmacussam insulam a praedonibus captus est. mansitque apud eos non sine summa [indigentia prope] | XL dies cum uno medico et cubiculariis duobus. Nam comes seruosque', etc.

these several countries. On the other hand, a marked difference grows up between the script of the North of Western Europe and that of the South. The sense of beauty inherent in the Italian nature is manifested in the fine handwriting which was developed by the scribes of Italy in the twelfth century or earlier on the model of the Carolingian minuscule. The cast of this script is entirely different from that of the North. It retains more of the round character of the earlier style and eventually hardens into the broad type of beautiful writing which is afterwards so characteristic of Italian mss of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. This style was not confined to Italy, but spread into Southern France and Spain. Thus the style of the North and the style of the South are roughly separated by a line drawn from West to East through central Europe. The German script, which belongs to the northern group, rather holds a place by itself, being generally of a more rugged and less graceful character than the rest.

**1167.** But the perfection of the literary hands of the thirteenth century could hardly be maintained. It is to be remembered that there is always an element of artificiality in such hands. The impetus given by the Carolingian reform to the general improvement of European handwriting was now beginning to spend its force. We have seen how it maintained its original character fairly well as it passed through the ninth and tenth centuries; how these were followed by the transitional period of the eleventh century; and how the close set and more ornamental scripts of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries succeeded. The counteracting influence of the cursive forms of writing, it must not be forgotten, had during all this time been present; and it was owing mainly to the persistent exactness of the schools of the thirteenth century that the literary script had not yielded earlier to that influence. But in the fourteenth century, as if tired out, it becomes more lax, and, in the hands of Northern Europe, the rigid style changes to one of a rounder and easier and more flowing character. In England the cursive charter-hand was frequently employed for the text of manuscript volumes; and while for certain classes, such as biblical and liturgical mss, the traditional book-hand was maintained, a mixed hand is not unusual for general purposes of literature. Still further, at the beginning of the fifteenth century, the charter-hand in some instances altogether usurped the field of literature and appeared in a set form adapted to the purposes of a book-hand. In other countries of Northern Europe the changes in the national scripts of the fourteenth century were on the same lines. In the South there is a difference. The Italian type of book-hand held fairly well to the old traditions and was widely used; its stronghold, however, as in the North, was among the biblical and liturgical mss. At the same time a more cursive style also appears in general literature, but so well moulded that, like the English charter-hand just noticed, it becomes an efficient book-hand. A specimen of the Italian literary hand of the older type,

The  
fourteenth  
century.



here employed in a classical MS, is selected from a *copy of Horace written at Cremona* in the year 1391<sup>1</sup>.

**S**ans beatis unicus fabius,  
**A**rudatur dies die.  
**N**one q; pergunt intar lune.  
**T**u seta, marmora da  
**L**ocas sub ipm funus. et sepulcri  
**I**memor strus domos.  
**M**ris q; baus obstrepentis urges

Fig. 140. Horace<sup>2</sup>. A.D. 1391.

1168. The fifteenth century witnessed the dissolution of the later national hands of the Middle Ages. The rounder and relaxed style of the previous century now breaks up into The fifteenth century. careless, irregular scripts of pointed style, the old traditional type of book-hand lingering on chiefly in liturgical mss. The deterioration is widespread and extends to the handwritings of all countries. Writing having now become a more universal accomplishment, the variety of hands is endless, and haste and abandonment of all leisurely movement are everywhere evident. Europe was emerging out of the old order of things, modern history was dawning, and the printing-press was soon to render the production of mss a thing of the past. It is needless to follow the disintegrating changes which passed over the styles of writing of the different nations during this century. It is enough to state in general terms that, as time went on, they became more and more disorganised and relaxed. But still a distinction is to be observed between the scripts of the North and the South of Europe. The northern hands especially fell away into different styles of the class of writing which, being adopted as a model for the printing types of the presses, passes by the name of Gothic or black-letter. Fortunately, to the lasting benefit of posterity for all time, other lines were followed in the South. In Italy the great intellectual movement of the Renaissance and the artistic sentiment of the country happily combined to produce those exquisitely written mss which, serving as models for the early type-founders of Italy, have preserved for our use the clear and simple Roman type, the origin of which we have traced back to

<sup>1</sup> British Museum, Add. MS, 11,964, *Pal. Soc.* i 249.

<sup>2</sup> *Odes*, ii 18, 14 f.

the Carolingian minuscule-hand of Charlemagne's reform (§ 1159). Of course the beautiful script of these MSS was not the ordinary handwriting of the day. Italy had suffered changes in her script in the fifteenth century as other nations had suffered them. The hurried pointed hand was there, as elsewhere. But the artistic taste of wealthy patrons extended to beautiful MSS, as well as to other works of art; and, fortunately, the beauty of a MS, in their eyes, consisted not only in its illumination and decoration, but also in its script. Hence the professional calligraphers sought for the finest models for their art, and went back to the noble Italian minuscule writing of the eleventh or twelfth century, which the scribes of that time had moulded from the imported Carolingian hand. No model could have been better. From the first third, then, of the fifteenth century, throughout its course, a magnificent series of MSS, examples of perfect calligraphy, was produced by the pens of Italian scribes, and, thanks to the revival of learning and the taste of the day, not a few of them were copies of the works of Latin classical authors. As a dated example, a *MS of Sallust*<sup>1</sup>, written at Florence in the year 1466, provides the following specimen of this fine class of writing.

Catilina uero longe a suis inter hostium caed uera  
reperitus est: paululum etiam spirans: ferocita-  
temq; anima quam habuerat uiuus in uultu re-  
tinebat: postremo ex omni copia neq; in prelio neq;  
in fuga quisquam ingenuus captus. Ita cuncti  
sue hostiumq; uite iuxta pepenerant. Neq; tamen  
exercitus populi romani letam aut incruentam  
uictoriam adeptus est. Nam strenuissimusq;sq;  
aut occiderat in prelio: aut grauius uulneratus

Fig. 141. Sallust<sup>2</sup>. A.D. 1466.

In the case of MSS written with such uniformity and finish, as these examples of the Italian calligraphy of the Renaissance, it is extremely difficult to determine their different periods with precision. A large proportion of them are unfortunately without dates. Some assistance, however, may be obtained from the style of ornamentation, a very common type of which is the interlacing vine tendril, generally drawn in white bands on a gilt or coloured ground. This style of ornament, like the writing, was a revival of early designs, the origin of which may be traced back to Lombardic art. In the earlier MSS of the class under discussion

<sup>1</sup> British Museum, Add. MS, 16,422, *Fal. Soc.* ii 59.

<sup>2</sup> *Catilina*, 61.

the ornament is simple but, as time proceeds, the interlacings become gradually more refined and intricate, so that, in dealing with a number of mss thus ornamented, it is not difficult to group them chronologically in decades.

N. de Wailly, *Éléments de Paléographie*, 1838; W. Wattenbach, *Anleitung zur lateinischen Palaeographie*, 4th ed. 1886; C. Paoli, *Programma Scolastico di Paleografia Latina*, 1888—1900; E. Maunde Thompson, *Handbook of Greek and Latin Palaeography*, 3rd ed. 1906, and *Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*, Oxford, 1912; *Facsimiles*, issued by the Palaeographical Society, two series, 1873—1883, 1884—1894; and by the New Palaeographical Society, 1903, etc., in progress; *Catalogue of Ancient Manuscripts in the British Museum*, Part ii, Latin, 1884; Vitelli and Paoli, *Collezione Fiorentina di facsimili paleografici*, 1884—1897; E. Chatelain, *Paléographie des Classiques Latins*, 1884—1900; *Album Paléographique avec des notices explicatives par la Société de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 1887; W. Arndt, *Schrifttafeln zur Erlernung der lateinischen Palaeographie*, 1903—1907; F. Steffens, *Lateinische Palaeographie*, 2nd ed. 1909; C. Zangemeister, *Inscriptiones parietariae Pompeianae* (in *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, iv), 1871, and *Tabulae ceratae Pompeis repertae* (C. I. L. iv, suppl. i), 1898; A. Mau, *Inscr. parietariae et vasorum fictilium* (in C. I. L. iv, suppl. ii), 1909; Th. Mommsen, *Instrumenta Dacica in tabellis ceratis conscripta* (C. I. L. iii 2), 1873; Wattenbach and Zangemeister, *Exempla Codicum Latinorum litteris maiusculis scriptorum*, 1876, 1879; E. Chatelain, *Uncialis Scriptura codicum Latinorum novis exemplis illustrata*, 1901, 1902; T. Sickel, *Monumenta Graphica medii aevi ex archivis et bibliothecis Imperii Austriaci collecta*, 1858—1882; A. Chroust, *Denkmäler der Schriftkunst des Mittelalters*, 1899, etc.; Monaci and Paoli, *Archivio Paleografico Italiano*, 1882—1890; *Paleografia Artistica di Montecassino*, 1876—1881; Ewald and Loewe, *Exempla Scripturae Visigoticae*, 1883; J. T. Gilbert, *Facsimiles of National Manuscripts of Ireland*, 1874—1884.

Also F. Steffens, *Proben aus Handschriften lateinischer Schriftsteller* (18 plates mainly selected from ed. 2 of the *Lateinische Palaeographie*), 1909; Max. Ihm, *Palaeographia Latina*, series i (18 plates), 1909; B. Bretholz, *Lateinische Palaeographie* (in *Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft*), 2nd ed. 1912; Sc. de Vries, *Album Palaeographicum* (60 plates from the Leyden series of complete facsimiles of important mss), 1909. The first two are specially intended for students.

### IX. 3. TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

1169. TEXTUAL CRITICISM may be defined as the skilled and methodical exercise of the human intellect on the settlement of *texts*.

Definition.

By a text we understand a document written in a language known, more or less, to the inquirer, and assumed to have a meaning which has been or can be ascertained. The object of the textual critic may then be defined as the restoration of a text, so far as possible, to its original form. By 'original form' we understand the form intended by its author. Such a restoration is often called a *critical recension*.

**1170.** Texts may be either *autographs*, or *immediate copies* of autographs, or *copies of copies*, and this in any degree. Autographs are not exempted from the operations of textual criticism. Texts, kinds of. Thus, editors of journals remove their contributors' 'slips of the pen.' Autographs. Editors of books correct, nowadays usually in footnotes, the similar lapses of their authors. Cicero is said to have thus played the part of textual critic for Lucretius. With this branch of textual criticism, however, modern Latin scholarship is not concerned.

**1171.** Not so with immediate copies. Textual criticism is called upon to repair the mischief to *inscriptions*, or texts inscribed upon stones, which has been caused by maltreatment, weathering, or by the errors of the stone-cutter. There are examples of this on every page in the great collection called the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Immediate copies. Inscriptions.

**1172.** The chief province of Latin textual criticism is elsewhere. It deals in the main with copies of copies. The texts which have come down to us were copied for the most part, not on stone, but on parchment, papyrus, or other perishable material. Of these texts several copies had to be made, both by way of precaution against wear and tear and as a means of satisfying the desire of other persons than the first possessor to become acquainted with their contents. If the copies of ancient Latin works had been mechanical reproductions of the originals, such, for example, as the photographic facsimiles of modern times, Latin textual criticism would have had very little to do. But Latin texts have not come to us in this way; but through copies made by the human hand directed, more or less, by the human intelligence. Now a copy made in this way never exactly reproduces that from which it is copied, that is, its *exemplar*. Errors inevitably creep in; and so a copy, *qua* copy, can never be the equal of the exemplar and may be much its inferior. The deterioration so produced increases with the number of successive copyings, as

Copies and exemplars. Deterioration of texts through copying. a numerical example will show. Let us take 100 to indicate perfect correctness, and let us suppose that a text *A* has been copied twice, and that the errors of the first copyist have removed 2 p.c. of the truth from his copy *B*, and the errors of the second copyist, who copies *B*, to have removed 2 p.c. from his copy *C*. The relative values of these copies will be *B* 98 and *C* 96.04. The importance of this is obvious when we remember that the text of every Latin author is a *transmitted text* or one which has passed through we do not know how many stages of copying. As illustrations we may take Plautus, *Epidicus* l. 10, where *habitor*, 'more portly', which has been preserved in a note by Donatus, the ancient commentator on Terence, *Eunuchus* II 2, 11, was first corrupted to *abilior*, which is preserved in the oldest extant manuscript, the Ambrosian palimpsest, and then further corrupted in the other copies to *agilior*. In Cicero, *pro Sestio* 130 *ad Numidici illius*, corrupted in the Paris MS to



*ad unum dicitus*, was further corrupted by the second hand to *ad unum dicto citius*.

1173. The first step towards the restoration of a Latin text is the examination of the evidence upon which it is to be based.

And this begins with the investigation of its transmitted form. Manuscripts.

For this we have to rely upon *manuscripts*. By manuscripts (MSS) we mean copies of the text made before the art of printing came into general use; and these may be either *extant* or *non-extant*.

1174. EXTANT MANUSCRIPTS. The evidence of extant manuscripts must be ascertained by *collation*. To collate a manuscript is to observe and record everything in it which may be of use towards determining what stood in the source, or sources, from which it is derived. A Latin manuscript is not usually a clean or single piece of writing: it will generally be found to contain alterations by erasure or substitution. These alterations may be due to the writer or writers of the MS (the *scribe* or *scribes*), or to some other person or persons (for there may be several) called *correctors*. The value of a 'correction' obviously depends upon its source; it will, for example, make a good deal of difference whether a correction is by the original scribe, that is, in the 'first hand', or from another hand. Accordingly, it is necessary to distinguish the various *hands* in a manuscript. Account must also be taken of the number of lines in each page, the number of pages in each quire, of gaps, omissions, erasures, illegibilities in the manuscript and so forth<sup>1</sup>. The work of collation cannot be considered complete until all the extant MSS of a text have been collated or at least examined. Extant Manuscripts.  
Collation of extant manuscripts.

Our task is sometimes lightened by the circumstance that there is only a single manuscript of the text. This is the case with the first six books of the *Annals* of Tacitus.

1175. But, more commonly, we are confronted with a number, often a large number, of manuscripts between whose respective claims to attention we have to determine. Here, in the first place, we shall neglect all manuscripts which are *derived by copying from extant manuscripts*. In so far as one MS is derived from another, it can tell us nothing that we do not know already, if the latter MS is known to us. Through the working of the tendency to deterioration already mentioned, its witness cannot be as good as that of the manuscript from which it is derived, and it may be much worse; and this is true *a fortiori*, if it is not derived from that manuscript directly but through some intermediary. Derived manuscripts.

But how can we tell that a MS is so derived? It must be later than the other MS, and the similarity between the two such as to admit of no other explanation. Agreement in singular but unimportant mistakes, omissions,

<sup>1</sup> Some practical hints for collating are given by Lindsay, *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation*, Appendix C.


apparently motiveless, of words or passages, which other MSS preserve, and above all the recurrence of errors which, though strange in themselves, are explicable as soon as we look at what stands in the earlier MS, will constitute such similarity. At one time it was thought that a manuscript of Propertius at Naples (Neapolitanus 268) might be of use in the re-constitution of the text; but this MS was convicted of being a copy of the Laurentian MS F at Florence by the evidence of iv 8, 3. Here F has a gap at the beginning of the line, and only the ending of the hexameter 'uetus est tutela draconis' and the marginal note 'non potuit legi in exemplari hoc quod deficit', while *Neap.* 268 has for the whole line 'non potuit legi uetus tutela draconis'. For the determination of the question whether one MS is a direct copy of another, as indeed for all questions affecting their character, actual inspection (*autopsy*) and study of the MSS or at least of facsimiles is most desirable, and often indispensable.

The general principle according to which we pronounce on the derivation of MSS is that *accident apart, identity of reading implies identity of source*. The source of a given reading may undoubtedly be the author's autograph, but, if not, it is some MS in the line of transmission. It may, however, be that the peculiar resemblances of two MSS, though not such as to warrant the derivation of either from the other, are sufficient to establish some connexion between them. We infer that this connexion arises from

Families of  
manuscripts.

community of source; and thus we arrive at the idea of *families* of MSS. Let us suppose that there exist seven MSS of a text, **ABCDEFG**. If we find that of these **A** stands apart, showing no great similarity to any of the other six, while **BCD** on the one side and **EFG** on the other side much resemble each other though differing considerably from the rest, we can express this by saying that **BCD** form a family, descended from a hypothetical common ancestor which we may call '**X**', and **EFG** another family, descended from a hypothetical ancestor which we may call '**Y**'. The readings of '**X**' which can be deduced by comparing those of **BCD** will be of a higher antiquity and of greater authority than any of the readings in **BCD** taken singly. And similarly for the readings of '**Y**' and those of **EFG**. Nor need we stop here: but we may further compare the readings of '**X**' and '**Y**' with each other, and with those of **A**; and thus deduce the readings of a still more remote ancestor which we may call '**Z**'. This '**Z**' will be the hypothetical *archetype* of all the extant MSS, and we shall thus get a pedigree of manuscripts or *stemma codicum* which may be given as follows:

Stemmata  
codicum.




If we have done our work properly, the text that we arrive at for '**X**' and '**Y**' will be freer from errors of copying than the texts of **BC** and **D**

and **EF** and **G** respectively, and that of '**Z**' freer from such errors than that of any existing ms.

**1176.** Our procedure is, however, by no means always so simple. That a text may be improved by the comparison of two different *codices* is not a modern discovery: and hence a number of Latin mss have been produced by a combination of two or more different mss. This is known as the 'crossing' or 'intermixture' of manuscripts, and the *codices* so produced are called *conflated* mss. In the accompanying stemma **M N** are conflated mss, being formed by the intermixture of **A** and **B** and of **D** and **E** respectively.

'Crossing.'  
Conflated  
MSS.



There may be any amount of intermixture, and, the greater its extent, the more difficult does it become to trace the transmission of a text. Whether intermixture produces an intrinsically better text of course depends upon the knowledge and judgement of the crosser. On the whole, it probably does; but in particular cases we cannot be very sure<sup>1</sup>. Since crossing implies the exercise of choice, it may, though it need not, be accompanied by other efforts at improvement. If it is, the text will probably suffer; for but a small portion of emendations made by scholars are real improvements, and a far smaller proportion of those made by scribes.

There is one case in which a 'conflated' codex has a special value, viz. when one of the mss from which its text has been compounded is lost. Then it will have the merit of preserving traces of the truth which would otherwise be irrecoverable. This is the case with **N**, the ms of Propertius at Wolfenbüttel.

**1177.** The strict *genealogical method* (as we may call it), by which the relationship of mss is determined, cannot be applied to conflated mss as such. Their mutual relations are often very difficult to disentangle. But we may occasionally detect in these mss a common strain, shown by their agreements in peculiar corruptions or in good readings which would have been hard to

Limitation to  
genealogical  
method.

<sup>1</sup> 'The gain or loss to the intrinsic purity of texts from mixture with other texts is, from the nature of the case, indeterminable. In most cases there would be both gain and loss; but both would be fortuitous, and they might bear to each other any conceivable proportion'. Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 8.

discover by unaided conjecture. This is practically an application of the genealogical method to *portions of manuscripts*.

**1178.** It may happen that good or instructive readings are found in manuscripts which are generally untrustworthy, and which are not worth while citing continuously. These may be either quoted under the name of a manuscript or, if brevity is desired, under a general title such as *codices deteriores*, or a general symbol such as  $\epsilon$ .

Codices  
deteriores.

(It must be clearly understood that the object of the genealogical method is not to arrive at the best text intrinsically, but at the most ancient one. The oldest text of any author will be inferior in point of excellence to that of modern editions, inasmuch as it will contain errors which have been removed by the conjectures of intelligent persons during many centuries.)

**1179.** NON-EXTANT MANUSCRIPTS. Several of the most valuable of ancient MSS have disappeared since their discovery in modern times. Of some of these we have copies, of greater or less trustworthiness. This is the case with the MS of the *Silvae* of Statius, and other writings, discovered by Poggio; and with the *Codex Bobiensis* of Rutilius, of which we have only sixteenth century copies. Of others we know only what the old scholars who saw them have told us. The readings of a valuable fragmentary MS of Tibullus, the 'Cuicatian Fragment', are known only from the entries made by Scaliger in the margin of a printed text in the library at Leyden, and from some notes in his edition of Tibullus.

Non-extant  
manuscripts.  
Excerpts.

What we have in such cases are not collations (the art of collating was not practised till the nineteenth century), but selections or *excerpts* which, it is to be feared, are often imperfect or erroneous. Further, it is not to be assumed that all the readings which the earlier scholars describe as being 'ex uetustis codicibus' are from older or better MSS than we possess, or indeed from MSS at all. It is to be feared that, just as Sir Walter Scott attributed to 'Old Plays' verses which he made for the headings of the chapters of his novels, so more than one of the earlier scholars invented imaginary *codices* to secure a wider currency for their own conjectures. The *codices* of Bosius, the editor of Cicero *ad Atticum* (1580), were, it is believed, of this character, and suspicion rests upon those of Barth, the author of the *Adversaria* (1624) and the editor of *Statius*, and others.

**1180.** Some texts or portions of texts are now extant only in printed books. The metrical treatise of Terentianus Maurus we have only in the editio princeps, 1497. All known MSS of Silius Italicus have a gap in the 8th book, 144—223. The missing lines are supplied on the authority of Jac. Constantius (1508), and they were first printed in the Aldine edition of 1523. Several undoubtedly genuine lines of Claudian, e.g. *Pan.* 201—204, first appeared in the 'Isengrinian' edition of 1534. It may be noted here as significant that the oldest printed

Old printed  
editions.



editions were often called 'printed codices' (*codices impressi typis*) as opposed to *codices scripti* or manuscripts.

1181. By a methodical use of the evidence of manuscripts extant and non-extant, we shall arrive at what we may call the *transmitted text*, of which the accompanying poem of Catullus and its parody will furnish illustrations. This will be a text different from any existing one. It will not be the *best* one, not even necessarily a good one: but the *most ancient one according to the direct line of transmission*, and the *purest*, in the sense of being the freest from traceable errors of copying and from unauthorised improvements.

The transmitted text.

CATULLUS IV, according to the transmitted text.

(Oldest MS late 14th century.)

Phasellus ille quem uidetis hospites  
aiunt fuisse nauium celerrimum  
neque illius natantis impetum tardis  
neque esse praeterire sine palmulis  
5 opus foret uolare sine linteo  
et hoc negat mina ei adriatici  
negare litus insulasue cicladas  
rhodumque nobilem horridamque tractam  
propontida trucemue ponticum sinum  
10 ubi iste post phasellus antea fuit  
comata silua nam citeorio in iugo  
loquente saepe sibilum edidit coma  
amastri pontica et citheri buxifer  
tibi haec fuisse et esse cognitissima  
15 ait phasellus ultima ex origine  
tuo stetisse dicit in cacumine  
tuo imbuisse palmulas in aequore  
et inde tot per impotencia freta  
herum tulisse, laeua siue dextera  
20 uocare cura siue utrumque iupiter  
simul secundus incidisset in pedem  
neque ulla uota litoralibus diis  
sibi esse facta cum ueniret amaret  
nouissime hunc ad usque limpidum lacum  
25 sed haec prius fuere nunc recondita  
senet quiete seque dedicat tibi  
gemelle castrum et gemelle castoris.

2 ait, celerrimus. 3 ullius, trabis.  
4 nequisse, siue. 5 siue. 6 minacis  
Hadriatici. 7 Cycladas. 8 Thraciam.  
11 Cytorio. 13 Cytore. 14 cognitissima.  
18 impotentia. 19 erum. 20 uocaret aura,  
Iuppiter. 22 deis. 23 a marei. 27 Castor.  
[In printing the two texts variations of ae, oe  
and e have been neglected.]

The Parody, according to the transmitted text.

(Oldest MS 12th century.)

Sabinus ille quidem uidetis hospites  
ait fuisse multo celerrimus  
neque illius uolantis impetum cisi  
nequisse praeterire siue mantuam  
5 opus foret uolare siue brixiam  
neque hoc negat typhonis aemuli domus  
negare nobilem insulamue caeruli  
ubi iste post Sabinus ante quincio  
bidente dicit atto(n)disse forcipe  
10 comata colla nequid orion iugo  
premente dura uulnus ederet iuba  
cremona frigidat et lutosa gallia  
tibi haec fuisse et esse cognitissima  
ait sabinus ultima ex origine  
15 tua stetisse ultima in uoragine  
tua in palude deposuisse sarcinas  
et inde tot per orbitosa milia  
iugum tulisse laeua siue dextera  
strigare mulas siue utrumque coeperat  
20 neque ulla uota semitalibus deis  
tibi esse sancta praeter hoc nouissimum  
paterna lora proximunque pectinem  
sed haec prius fuere nunc eburnea  
sed etque sedes eque dedicat tibi  
25 gemelle castor et gemelle castoris.

1 quem. 2 mulio. 3 ullius (cf.  
Catullus). 6 et, Tryphonis, domum. 8  
Quintio. 9 attondisse contra metrum.  
forcie Heyne. 10 ne Cytorio. 12 trigida.  
15 dicit (in). 16 deposisse. 19 mula,  
utrimque. coeperant conj. Most edd.  
mark a lacuna after this line. 21 sibi,  
facta. 24 sedetque sede seque.

The received corrections of the poem and the parody are those given in the notes without names attached.

**1182.** For the bettering of this text we can call in aids of a partial or subsidiary character called by the general name of *testimonia*.  
 Testimonia.

*Anthologies* (*Florilegia*) or collections of extracts medieval or ancient. The oldest authority for Catullus 62 is an anthology of the ninth century at Paris; for Statius, *Silvae* ii 7, one at Florence of the tenth or eleventh century. A few short extracts from Tibullus are preserved in a collection of the tenth century at Munich, and a good many in one of the eleventh century contained in two MSS at Paris.  
 Anthologies.

**1183.** *Translations* from one language into another may be of help in restoring the original or *vice versa*. A learned monk of the fourteenth century, Maximus Planudes, translated into Greek a number of Latin works including the *Metamorphoses* and *Heroides* of Ovid. At *Met.* xii 256 our MSS have *spumantem*, but Planudes had ἐκπύοντα, that is *sputantem*; in the previous line the MSS *Belates*, but Planudes Πελάτης. Again, the text of Germanicus' translation of the *Phaenomena* of Aratus 66 has 'non illi nomen, non magni causa laboris'. This has been corrected, from Aratus 64 f, τὸ μὲν οὐτις ἐπίσταται ἀμφαδὸν εἰπεῖν | οὐδ' ὅτινι κείνος κρέματα πόνωι, into 'non ulli nomen, non cognita causa laboris'.  
 Translations.

**1184.** *Direct Quotations*, ancient or medieval, either of passages or single words, and either with or without the author's name. Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* vi 20, 6, quotes a reading of Catullus xvii 4, *ebria acina*, which has disappeared from our MSS. A Pompeian Inscription has preserved Prop. iv 5, 47 f., with two words *dantis*—*pulsat* corrupted in our MSS to *dantes*—*pulset* (p. 738 f. *supra*). At iii 8, 37 the grammarians Priscian and Diomedes attest *nexisti* for MS *tendisti*.  
 Quotations.

**1185.** *Obvious Imitations* (including *Parodies*). These may be used to restore the words of the imitator or of the imitated, as occasion may require. It is not necessary that the imitation should be conscious, in which case it approximates to quotation, but it must be unmistakable. Latin literature, and especially Latin poetry, is very full of imitations. In Lucr. vi 1132, 'et iam pigris balantibus aegror' (of the plague affecting sheep) *lanigeris* is rightly restored from Ov. *Met.* vii 540, 'lanigeris gregibus balatus dantibus aegros'. If Seneca, *Oed.* 133, 'prima uis tardas tetigit bidentes,' is an imitation of the passage of Lucretius, it would appear as though the text of Lucretius had been corrupted between the epochs of Ovid and Seneca.  
 Imitations and parodies.

**1186.** *Ancient Commentaries*: such as those of Servius on Virgil and Donatus on Terence. Thus Servius' note on *Aen.* xii 801 shows that he there found *edit*, not *edat*, although the text quoted at the heading of his note has been corrupted by the scribes. In *Andria* 289 *genium* for *ingenium* is restored from Donatus.  
 Ancient commentaries.

1187. These various kinds of auxiliary evidence to what stood in a text, along with the record of variant readings directly attested by manuscripts, make up the *apparatus criticus* of a text. The support which both together give to a reading may be called its *documental probability*.

Apparatus  
criticus.  
Documental  
probability.

1188. In order that we may succeed in restoring our text from the evidence available, we must know and weigh the causes which tend to vitiate it in its various kinds.

Causes of  
corruption.

We will speak first of those which affect the direct transmission. These are either *external* or *internal*.

1189. (A) *External*. A text may become illegible through damp or constant thumbing; portions of it may be torn away, or whole quires become detached, and either lost or misplaced. If this has happened on a large scale, the critic is helpless. But minor injuries may sometimes be traced and remedied. The weakest parts of a manuscript book were the outer margins, and hence the beginnings and the ends of lines (whether verse or prose) were specially liable to injury. It is a help to know whether the beginning or the end of a line came upon the outer margin, and hence the determination of the pagination of an archetype, such as was done by Lachmann in the case of Lucretius, has more than a mere antiquarian value. In Lucretius book 1, the leaf of the archetype containing 1068 f. was injured. The *ends* of 1068—1075, and on the other side of the leaf the *beginnings* of the corresponding lines, 1094—1101, were lost though the ends were visible, as the scribe did not care to copy headless verses, and so 1094—1101 are now irrecoverable. As the first letters of poems and paragraphs always and of verses were often written separately, and by a different person (called the *rubricator*), these were liable to omission. The Bodleian ms of Catullus begins poem v with *Iuamus*, and viii with *Iser*. In Manilius i 916 for *Alea* some mss have *lea* and another, by a false conjecture, *Proelia*.

External.

(B) *Internal*. These are those due to default on the part of the scribe or copyist, and they are very numerous. They may be arranged roughly in the order in which the volition of the scribe is absent or present as involuntary (or mechanical), semi-voluntary and voluntary; or again as they affect single signs (letters, etc.), words, lines or even larger units.

Internal.

In what follows the errors noted are illustrated where possible by reference to the two specimens of transmitted texts on p. 797. **C** means Catullus iv; **P** the parody of that poem.

## 1190. INVOLUNTARY CORRUPTIONS.

### *Errors of the Eye.*

(a) *Confusions of Letters*. These are very numerous and they differ with the kind of handwriting<sup>1</sup>. Thus E, F are more liable to be confused in majuscules, but (s) j, f in

<sup>1</sup> On these see above, pp. 765—791.

minuscules; *c* and *e* in the Carolingian minuscule hand, but *c* and *t* in the angular writing of the thirteenth century and later. Some of the confusions occurring in Latin MSS will be at once intelligible on reference to the illustrations given in the section on palaeography, e.g. E and I Fig. 132, L and I Fig. 133, *s* and *r* Fig. 137, *c* and *t* Fig. 139, *f* (*s*) and *f* Fig. 140, groups like *un*, *im*, *ui* etc. Fig. 140.

Confusions also occur when the manuscript which a scribe is copying is in an unfamiliar writing and contains letters or symbols resembling characters in the script to which he is accustomed having a different value. Many of our Latin texts, e.g. Catullus, show by the confusions that they exhibit that they have passed through several distinct stages of writing.

(For examples of letter-confusion see C 3, 6, 20.)

(b) *Omissions of letters.* The Vatican fragment of Virgil (F) has in *Georg.* iii 4, IM for IAM; *ib.* 154, ARIOR for ACRIOR [P 6].

(c) *Transpositions of letters or syllables (Anagrammatism)* Prop. i 13, 31 (F) *erohinis* for *heroinēs*, Hor. *A. P.* 223 *incelebris* for *inlecebris* [C 3].

(d) *Additions of letters* (from various causes). *Aen.* vi 699 the St Gallen fragment has VORA instead of ORA, 704 ENEMVS instead of NEMVS, *ib.* iv 32 F has PERPERTVM for PERPETVA [C 11, P 10, 12].

(e) *Confusions of Abbreviations.* Prop. iii 7, 46 *u<sup>i</sup>* (*ubi*) and *n<sup>i</sup>* (= *nisi*). At Prop. i 20, 21, F corrupted *h<sup>o</sup>oum*, i.e. *heroum*, to *hōium* (i.e. *hominum*). The same error in [Tib.] iii 4, 26 has produced a further corruption, *metri gratia*, to *humanum*. [P 1.]

(f) *Confusions of Words.* Any words in the language may be confused, provided their general similarity is sufficient to overpower their unlikeness in some particular. The unlikeness may be of various kinds. Thus (i) one or two letters in the words may be different: *lumen*, *limen*, *numen* are interchanged; (ii) there may be one or two letters less or more: *paco*, *placo*; *gravidus*, *avidus*; (iii) the letters may be the same, but in a different order, *suscipe* for *suspice*, Hor. *Ep.* i 6, 18; *manet* for *tamen* Ov. *M.* ii 485; (iv) the single letters may be different, but the general look of the word may be the same, *sunt* for *finit* at Manilius iii 229, *iuuenis* for *mucius* iv 31; (v) the words may be alike when abbreviated. Thus *p<sup>o</sup>tus* (*pectus*), *c<sup>o</sup>pus* (*corpus*), *t<sup>o</sup>pus* (*tempus*) are constantly confused. [C 27, P 21.]<sup>1</sup>

*Loss of letters, syllables, words or lines through similarity of writing (Homoigraphon)*

**Homoigraphon.** When the similar letters stand next to each other in the line, we have *haplography*, Lucr. i 861, *core* for *cor*<*por*>*e*. In Plautus *Miles* 837, *bino suppro* et *promo cellam creditam*, et *promo* is omitted by some mss. The similar letters may be in the line below or several lines below, and the scribe's eye may slip, and he will then leave out all that intervenes. Thus in Prop. iii 10, N omits the couplet 17, 18, the last word of both 16 and 18 being *caput*. (This cause of loss is often called *homoiteleuton*, or similarity of endings: but the similarity may be at any point, the beginning or middle, just as much as the end.)

*Repetitions, Dittography, etc.* Letters, groups of letters, words and lines are written twice (or oftener) instead of once. Ovid *Fasti* vi 735 *iuuenis stellis* for *iuuenis telis*. Tac. *Ann.* i 74 (Med.) *ind* inditam for *inditam*. In Livy xxvii 11, 11 the words 'dedissent et ius liberum eosdem' are written three times in the *codex Puteaneus*. Repetition may cause Loss. The end of Lucr. i 1023 was lost owing to the end of 1022 being written twice [P. 19]. Other repetitions and anticipations occur when the scribe's eye wanders into the neighbouring (preceding or following) context, Virg. *Aen.* xii 343, IMBRASVB the Medicean for IMBRASVS. In Prop. ii 19, 25, F has *boco* for *luco* from *boues* in 26. [P 6 (cf. 3, 4), 15 (cf. 14).]

*Omissions of groups of letters, words, lines through simple negligence.* *Aen.* iv 462,

<sup>1</sup> Words may also be confused through the sound or through the sense. See below, p. 801.



CVLMINVS for culminibus. Small words not necessary to the sentence are especially liable to be omitted. Plaut. *Truc.* 215 *sua* by the Palatine family of MSS, *ib.* 216 *ei* by the *Ambrosianus*. [C 7.]

## 1191. SEMI-VOLUNTARY AND VOLUNTARY CORRUPTIONS.

In *semi-conscious and semi-voluntary change* the mind of the scribe is involved to a greater or less degree, sometimes with, and sometimes without, his knowledge and will.

*Phonetic confusions* appear to belong here. Scribes interchanged the letters which sounded alike to them, though to the eye there might be no resemblance between them. So *i* and *y*, *e*, *ae* and *oe*, *u* (consonant) and *b*. *h* not being pronounced was omitted or inserted at random. In Hor. *carm.* iii 23, 2 *Phidyale* appears as *Phillide*. In Stat. *Theb.* vii 12 *habet* was written for *hauet* (*auet*) [C 6, 7, 8, 18, 19. P 8]. It must not be thought that these are *errors of the ear*, such as might arise from Dictation. It has, indeed, been asserted that in ancient times texts intended for sale were dictated to scribes; but there is no direct proof of this, and it was not the mediaeval practice.

*Transposition of Parts of Words.* Ov. *Fast.* iv 160 *nomine corda* for *nomina corde*; *Aetna* 1 *ruptisque caui* for *ruptique cauis*. Prop. ii 32, 2 *facti crimina lumen habent* for *facti lumina crimen habent*.

Semi-conscious and semi-voluntary change.  
Phonetic confusions.

Transposition.

*Transposition of Whole Words.* Hor. *Epod.* ii 18 *extulit agris* for *agris* (*aruis*) *extulit*. S. i 6, 69 *quisquam uere* for *uere quisquam*. Prop. i 2, 24 *forma satis ampla* for *ampla satis forma*. The change is commonly to a more usual order of the words or (especially in verse) to a more usual rhythm. Livy's preface, as Quintilian ix 4, 74 tells us, began with a part of a hexameter, but the sentence was tampered with even in Quintilian's time, and all our MSS have it in the form *facturusne sim operae pretium*.

*Transpositions of one or more Lines.* This kind of transposition is really arrested loss. A scribe finds that he has accidentally omitted a line or a number of lines, and sooner than disfigure his page or waste his material and his time he writes the omitted portion in the margin at the foot of the page or in the text out of its place, usually adding a sign to show where it should come. The next scribe may easily overlook the sign, and the passage is thus permanently misplaced. *Homoigraphon* is often the ultimate cause of transposition but not always. In [Tibullus] iii 10, 16 sqq. the scribe passed from the *tibi* in 16 to the *tibi* in the next pentameter (22), thus omitting the couplet 21—22 which was afterwards put in the wrong place. In Prop. i 15, lines 15—16, which should follow 20, were omitted from their proper place without any such reason.

*Grammatical Assimilations to the Context.* Many of these may be purely mechanical mistakes as is shown by cases like Prop. iv 1, 12 *pellites—patres* for *pellitos* p., *ib.* iii 7, 55 *flens tamen extremens* (F) for *extremis*. Ov. *Fast.* v 682 *ablue praeterita perfida uerba* die, die gen. being mistaken for abl. Ov. *Fast.* iv 507 f, *quod nunc Cerialis Eleusin* | *dicitur hoc Celei rura fuisse, or fuere, senis*, where one or other of the readings must have been a grammatical assimilation. [C 2, P 6.]

Grammatical assimilations.

*Wrong Junctions and Divisions of words.* These will generally go back to a stage when texts were written without word division. Lucr. iii 598 *anima eius* for *animae uis*. Prop. ii 32, 5 *deportantes sed abitur* for *deportant esseda Tibur*. [C 4, 6, 20, 23. P 10, 24.]

Wrong word divisions.

*Interchange of words or phrases of Kindred or Contrasted meaning*, that is of *Synonyms* or *Antonyms*. *et* and *ac* are often interchanged; so at Juvenal i 21, 98. Plautus *Ps.* 1295 *in os igitur* is in the *Ambrosian* palimpsest, *ergo in os* in the *Palatine* MSS; *magis* is written for *minus* at Manil. iv 110, *nam neque mortiferas quisquam minus oderit herbas*. At Hor. *S.* i 1, 79 one MS has *malorum* for *bonorum* though this might be a gloss.

Synonyms, antonyms and unemphatic words.

*Omissions or insertions of seemingly Unimportant Words.* Plaut. *Bacch.* 134, *ibidem* ego meam operam perdidi ubi tu tuam, ego is dropped in some MSS. At Hor. *S.* i 9, 42, ego ut contendere durum | cum uictore sequor, some MSS have durum est.

*False Recollections.* Something in the passage before a scribe may suggest to him something else and he will write down what is in his mind instead of what is before his eyes. Ovid *M.* xii 103 *inritamenta malorum*, for *inritamina cornu*, has come from *M.* i 140. Columella, x 433, wrote *hactenus hortorum cultus, Siluine, docebam* but the MSS have *hactenus agrorum, or aruorum*, from Virg. *G.* iv 558.

*Incorporation of Marginalia.* These may be explanations (*glosses*), illustrative quotations or readers' comments. The intruder often drives out a genuine word. In Pan. *Messallae* (Tibullus iii 7) 55 for *lotos*, which is preserved in the Cuiacian Fragment, the extant MSS read *cyclops* which is a gloss on *Aetnaeae Neptunius incola rupis* in the next line. In Tib. ii 5, 69 for *Aniena* they have *Albana*, which is simply a corruption of *Albunea*, the name of the Sibyl to whom the line refers. At iv 5, 57 sq. Propertius alludes to i 2, 1 sq. Some reader observing this wrote that distich in the margin and it now stands in the text immediately after 54.

*Interpolation.* This is a conscious tampering with the text by way of substitution or addition. It would include omissions also when they are designed; but these are harder to detect. It is often difficult to tell whether a change was designed or not. In Propertius *l.c.* (§ 1184) the corruption of *nexisti* to *tendisti* is not a simple error of copying: but whether it is due to some vague notion of *tendere retia* floating before the scribe's mind, or whether it is due to incorporation of a gloss *tendisti*, afterwards altered for metrical reasons or through simple haplography (as happened in Tac. *Ann.* iii 24), is hard to say. [P 9, 16 if designed alterations.]

There is always some motive for interpolation, e.g. some obvious corruption or lacuna in the text which the interpolator endeavours unskilfully to amend or to supply. At Prop. iii 1, 27 (where the poet is referring to the famous battle of Achilles with the Rivers) all that was legible of the line was *Idaeum Simoenta Iouis cū* and in the oldest extant MS all after *Iouis* is omitted, but some scribe taking the reference to be to the birth of Iupiter on Mt Ida in Crete filled up the line with the reading of the vulgate *cum < abula parui >*. These insertions, which may be called *stop-gap interpolations*, are common in Italian MSS of the Renaissance where the text is lacunose and are easy to detect when, as often, they appear in different forms. Thus the hexameter in Tibullus ii 3, lost after v. 78 (74), was variously supplied in the fifteenth century; *ah pereant artes et mollia ruru colendi* (Tommaso Seneca) and *o pereant cultus et tinctae murice lanae* (Pontanus).

*Metrical interpolation.* Verses which a scribe cannot scan or whose rhythm is strange to him are often changed. Prop. ii 15, 43 *non ferrum crudele neque* esset *bellica nauis* appears as *n. f. c.* esset neque *b. n.* in some MSS.

*Aesthetic.* Alterations for the purpose of removing objectionable matter occur but rarely, though they are found, e.g., in certain MSS of the epigrams of Martial.

*Harmonising interpolations*, such as are common in the MSS of the Synoptic Gospels in order to bring the different Evangelists into exact agreement, are not uncommon. They are naturally most frequent in quotations. Thus in the passage of Gellius already cited (§ 1184) the quotation from Catullus has been made to agree with the current text.

*Interpolation*, or rather forgery, for reasons extraneous to the text, which may be on any scale from the introduction of a sentence or a verse to the manufacture of a long passage or even a whole chapter or poem, is undoubtedly found, but it is not to be ascribed to the copyists. The verses prefixed in some MSS to Hor. *Sat.* i x may serve as an example. Here we may mention *Actors' interpolations* in plays, which have left their traces in the 'doublets'

which are found in the texts of certain plays of Plautus. Thus in the *Pseudolus*, l. 1245 is an obvious doublet of the longer version 1239—1244.

1192. It will be observed from the foregoing that there are very often more causes than one at work in producing corruption and that consequently it is not always possible to assign the operating cause in a particular case. Where this is so, method demands that we should give the preference to the cause known to be most widely operative and regard the others as possibly or actually contributory.

Concurrence of  
corruptions.

Furthermore corruption is apt to breed corruption, and if circumstances are for any reason, extrinsic or intrinsic, unfavourable to the preservation of the purity of a text, the result may be such as to render nugatory all the efforts of textual criticism. Large parts of the *Aetna* are in this condition.

1193. A knowledge of the various errors and mischiefs which may affect a text in transmission necessarily precedes all judgement upon its condition and its contents. If we find that certain transmitted readings can be probably explained as mere corruptions of other readings which are believed, upon other grounds, to have stood in the archetype, then these latter are said to be *transcriptionally probable*. In determining transcriptional probability, regard to the history of the text, that is, to the ascertained circumstances of its transmission, is of the first importance, nor must any corruptions be postulated which are without actual warrant in that particular tradition. The exemplar of the two chief MSS of Lucretius was written in thin rustic capitals, with no word divisions. How absurd then it would be to introduce readings into the text of that poet which imply mistakes such as a fifteenth-century Italian scribe might make in copying an Irish exemplar in which the words were already separated! Further, since different scribes are liable to different kinds of error, we must be cautious about assuming any kind, of which we can find no traces in the *apparatus criticus*.

Transcrip-  
tional  
probability.

1194. In dealing with *testimonia* we must be careful not to be misled by insufficient or accidental resemblances and differences, by harmonising interpolations, or by the misrecollections of a quoter. In a quotation from Propertius, iii 16, 14, a Pompeian inscription has *feriat* for the *noceat* of the direct transmission.

Errors in  
testimonia.

1195. Up to the present point our procedure has been merely antiquarian, and its aim to discover what is the earliest ascertainable form of the text with which we are dealing<sup>1</sup>. But we cannot stop here, or decline to consider the intrinsic character of what we have thus arrived at. If the transmitted reading (that upon which the manuscripts are agreed), or the 'traditional' reading (that which both manuscripts and direct *testimonia* support), is wholly destitute of

Intrinsic  
probability.

<sup>1</sup> This is what Lachmann, *Novum Testamentum, Gr. et Lat.* praef., calls *recensere* as distinct from *emendare* (§ 1282 *infra*).

sense: or if it involves some flagrant contradiction in the passage, or in its immediate neighbourhood, or some marked and inexplicable deviation from the forms, constructions, or usages of words characteristic of the author, or some purposeless and tautologous repetition, or some violation of the laws of metre and rhythm as observed by the author, or some obvious and unaccountable break in the thought, or some inexhaustibly disordered sequence in the same, then we are entitled to say that it is corrupt, however strong may be the external evidence in its favour. For, as Bentley said, *indicia corrupti non sunt, sed corruptio indicia sunt*<sup>1</sup>. These indications may occur singly or together. Thus, in C 2, *uand* is condemned by syntax and metre and in 27 *astrum* by sense, syntax and metre: but in P 9, *attodisse* by metre only, and *attodisse* by accident only.

If the corruption thus detected is such as, we see, cannot be removed, then we dismiss the passage as hopelessly corrupt. But more often we can discern a remedy or remedies; and when, in such cases, we can hit upon a correction which satisfies, in all respects, the demands of sense, context, grammar, style, metre and rhythm, we describe this correction as *intrinsically probable*. If further the word proposed is such as is likely to have been corrupted through ascertained channels of deterioration to the traditional or to the transmitted reading with the variants of that reading, we shall claim for our proposal or conjecture that it has the support of both intrinsic and extrinsic probability. The concurrence of these two probabilities will supply the highest degree of probability to which conjectural *emendations* or *corrections* can attain.

1196. A proper estimate of intrinsic probabilities calls for far more know-

ledge, judgement and insight than are needed in the case of  
Emendation.
extrinsic probability; and conjectural emendation is at once

the highest and the most difficult part of the textual critic's task. But this has not been generally understood; and in consequence it has been confounded with guessing, and pursued with a superficiality and *curiositas* that has often brought it into disrepute. The so-called 'conservative' school of critics have made up on this, and endeavoured to thrust emendation

So-called  
 'Scientific  
 Interpretation'.

from its proper sphere (the removal of the absolutely vicious) by the methods of what is sometimes called 'Scientific Interpretation'. These are twofold. First, the forcible extraction from the text of a meaning, which is not in the

words, and which would be admitted not to be in them, were it not seen to be required by the context. This is facilitated by the use made of *Translatio*. Translation is a necessary instrument for the expressing of the thought of one language in terms of another, but this reproduction is always imperfect, and, in the case of dead languages (in particular, a translator is often the sport of illusory resemblances and differences. The only safeguard is the study of the evidence in uncorrupted passages of the classical authors themselves. An ancient parable is worth many times as

<sup>1</sup> On Horace, *Carm.* iii 27, 15.



much as a modern correspondence. The second method is that of ascribing to the 'idiosyncrasy' of the author abnormalities and eccentricities, which, if there were discrepancy in the tradition, would be unhesitatingly attributed to its faultiness. That there are imperfections in all human work, and therefore in the literary masterpieces of the ancients, cannot be denied. But the systematic retention of what is faulty, on the ground that it may conceivably be genuine, will do more harm on the whole to the original than its systematic rejection. And, if editors are to consult the preferences of their readers, most of these would choose to have in their copies of an ancient classic what he probably, or it may be possibly, wrote rather than what he did not write, or at least ought not to have written.

1197. Hopelessly corrupt passages are not the only ones where a textual critic can reach no certain, or even probable, conclusion. It may happen that both of two alternative readings have equal external support, and equal intrinsic merit. Sometimes the difference is slight and immaterial as in Juvenal, i 21, where the variants are *ac* and *et*. Sometimes it is not, as in vii 139, where they are *ut redeant uteres* and *fidimus eloquio*. Such doublets may be due to various causes: injuries to the text at a period beyond our power to trace, which have been repaired in diverse ways; different recensions or editions of a text in early times; different actors' versions in a play; also, it may be, alternative readings in the author's unpublished autograph. To this last kind may belong the doublet in Lucretius vi 529 f, 'nix uenti grando gelidaeque pruinae | et uis magna geli, magnum duramen aquarum | et mora quae fluuios passim refrenat euntis', where both the lines describing river-ice are in the true Lucretian manner.

Idiosyncrasy.

Irremoveable  
uncertainties.  
'Doublets'.

The same thing happens with conjectures. In Manilius, v 267, 'munditiae cultusque — artesque decorae', *placent* is usually inserted to fill the gap, but *inuant* seems just as likely.

In all these cases practical convenience requires that the editor should decide between the variants, though it is an even chance that his choice will be wrong.

The following books, amongst others, will be found of use to the student of Latin textual criticism: H. Hagen, *Gradus ad Criticem*, 1879; H. W. Johnston, *Latin Manuscripts*, Chicago, 1897; W. M. Lindsay, *Introduction to Latin Textual Emendation*, 1896; J. N. Madvig, *Adversaria Critica*, 1871-3, especially Book I of Vol. I and Vol. II; B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the original Greek*, 1882.

On right procedure, and on prevalent errors in the critical method (a subject which could not be treated fully in these pages), reference may be made to the present writer's article on *Textual Criticism* in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (11th edition), and to his paper on *Flaws in Classical Research* (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1908); also to A. E. Housman's *Introductions* to his texts of *Manilius* and *Juvenal*.

## X. LANGUAGE, METRE, HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP.

### X. 1. THE LANGUAGES OF ITALY.

1198. IN the map of early Italy perhaps the most striking points to the student are (1) the number of different peoples that appear in it, (2) the small space occupied by the Latins. These points are only emphasized by a consideration of the linguistic features of early Italy. From the earliest times of which any historical record exists, the Roman power was spreading. But the Romans, unlike the Athenians, made no proud boast that their stock was coeval with the land itself, and had never moved from its original seat. Roman chronology, which was not likely to minimise the early importance of Rome, did not carry it farther back than the middle of the eighth century B.C. The date from which the Greeks professed to be able to mark with precision the events of their later history—the first Olympiad—in fact preceded the date fixed for the foundation of Rome by about a quarter of a century (776 B.C. ; 753 B.C.). But records are too scanty for us to trace the linguistic history of the Italian peninsula from so early a period. A more practical date is 240 B.C. By then, it is true, Roman power had already extended to a large part of Italy and Sicily, but the ancient dialects had not perished under the influence of Roman civilisation and government, or—what was even more effective—the destruction wrought to the Italian populations by the Hannibalic war. That destruction was only carried to greater lengths by the continued levies for the Roman army in the following years, and was finally consummated a century and a quarter later by the Social War and the last great struggle with Sulla at the Colline Gate in 82 B.C. Even then the dialects of rural Italy were not altogether extinguished ; in Campanian towns Oscan was in use till the first century of the Christian era, and in remote valleys of the Apennines may have survived on the lips of a few far into the second century A.D. But with Sulla's victory the last chance of any Italic dialect proving a serious rival to Latin had for ever passed away.

1199. The dialects which, like the Oscan, might have threatened the supremacy of Latin, had the new capital of the Italians at Corinium with

The spread  
of Latin.

its Oscan name *Vitellū*, that is *Italia*, proved a successful rival to Rome, were of the same family as Latin itself, though in externals perhaps not very closely resembling it. But, besides these, there were various other languages in the peninsula, like poor relations hanging about its gates. Of most of these we know very little and, as they have for later times no great historical importance, it will not be necessary to dwell long upon them. Of these the first is Messapian, the language of the people who lived in the heel of Italy. It is only recently that the inscriptions of this language have been carefully examined and the numerous forgeries weeded out. It has sometimes been conjectured that the Messapians and the Iapygians were two separate peoples with different languages. Of difference in language, however, there is no satisfactory evidence. Owing to the similarity of tribal and place names it is conjectured that the language and people alike came across the Adriatic from Illyria. Herodotus, on the other hand, has a legend (vii 170) that the aborigines of Crete, except the inhabitants of Praesos and Polichne, abandoned the island, and after various adventures were shipwrecked upon the heel of Italy, where they henceforth remained. In recent years three fragments of the unknown tongue spoken by the Eteocretans have been discovered at Praesos or in its neighbourhood, but, even allowing for the lapse of many centuries between the date suggested by the legend and the fragments discovered in Crete, the forms do not suggest close connexion. Of Messapian we know very little, though several of the inscriptions are of considerable length; one is of 15, another of 19 lines. It is, however, clear that original *δ* sounds changed to *ā*, that *ō* sounds remained, that the voiced aspirates *bh*, *dh* lost the aspiration and appear as *b*, *d*, that the genitive of original *o* stems appears as *-ihī* with the stem vowel retained before the ending and that there is a genitive in *-as* corresponding to the *-os* of consonant stems in Greek. An example of the language is ΠΛΑΣΤΑΣ | ΜΟΛΔΑΤΘΕΙΑΙ | ΒΙΛΙΑΕΤΘΕΤΑ | ΗΙΠΑΔΕΣΑΠΡΟΔΤΑ. This is translated by the commentators as 'Etheta daughter of Plazet Moldatthes set up [this] to Aphrodite'. The form *bilia* with the sense of the Latin *filia* suggests the modern Albanian *bil'ë* 'daughter'; *hipa-des* is supposed to be a compound from the same root as *τίθημι*, Latin *facio*.

1200. In the north-eastern corner of Italy are found a considerable number of other inscriptions, written in a bold and distinctive alphabet, which, from the district where they are found, are called Venetic. According to some scholars, these also are the records of an Illyrian people which had forced its way thus far; according to Professor Conway, they resemble most closely the Eteocretan. Both theories have difficulties; the first, because we know so little of Illyrian that we cannot tell with certainty even if it was the ancestor of the modern Albanian or not; the second, because as yet we know so little of Eteocretan that some scholars are in doubt whether it is an Indogermanic language at

all. If Illyrian resembled the modern Albanian, it belonged, like Slavonic, Armenian and the Aryan languages, to the *satem*-branch of the Indogermanic family, in which certain sounds which appear as gutturals in Greek, Latin, Keltic and Germanic are found replaced by sibilants. Neither Messapian nor Venetic, however, presents any certain examples of such a change. As the name system of Illyria corresponds in many details, and as there was connexion also between Illyria and Messapia, it seems most probable that modern Albanian is not the descendant of ancient Illyrian but the language of successful invaders. Most of the Venetic inscriptions are clearly either dedications or grave-stones. A common type is *mexo Vhuḡia zonasto Rehtiaḡ*. This is generally translated *me Fugia donavit Rectiae*, but though the proper names are certain and *zonasto* may be guessed to be connected with the same root as *donum* and *dare* in Latin, it is not certain that *mexo* is a personal pronoun. Another series of inscriptions begins with *exo* followed by words which appear to be in the genitive: *exo* has naturally been identified with *ego*, but this seems in the circumstances not very likely.

**1201.** Of the language of the Ligurians, who in Roman times were settled round the Gulf of Genoa, but who earlier undoubtedly occupied a much wider area, we know next to nothing. Some inscriptions from Ornavasso which have been attributed to them are almost certainly Keltic. From the anthropological side, and less strongly from the linguistic side, the question has been raised whether the Ligurians were themselves of Indogermanic stock, and consequently whether their language, instead of belonging to the Indogermanic family, may not have been akin to that which survives on the northern and southern slopes of the Pyrenees as Basque—a language to which no European language of the present day has a close relation.

**1202.** Whatever the Ligurians may have been, their language contributed little, so far as we know, to the Latin vocabulary. With the language of the vigorous tribes who flooded northern Italy and had occupied the valley of the Po before 400 B.C., it was very different. These were the Gauls, the most migratory of all European peoples, who are found at different times in southern Germany, in Gaul and the British Islands, in Italy, in Greece, and even as far to the east as Galatia in Asia Minor. Their earliest conflict with the Romans, when they swept down through Etruria, won the battle of the Allia against the forces of Latium, and occupied Rome about 388 B.C., was indelibly impressed upon the memory of the Romans. From them in later times the Romans borrowed many words, especially names of weapons (*gaesum*, 'spear'), and words dealing with horses and driving—*mannus* (according to Consentius), *cisium*, *reda*, *petorritum*, and many more. The Romans had a hard fight with the Gauls before they mastered them in the Po-valley: this was followed by the long-continued struggle for the possession of Gaul, a struggle which was ended only by Julius Caesar. The relations between



Gaulish and the Italic languages of the Latin and Oscan stock were very close. Similar, if not in all cases identical, changes had befallen their noun and verb system; an adverbial *i* used as genitive in *o*-stems, distinct from locative *i* for earlier *ei* or *oi* in *domi*, is characteristic of both groups. Both have developed a passive inflexion ending in *-r* to which there is no parallel elsewhere, both have remodelled their future system by suffixes in *b* or *f* (from an earlier *bh*), *amabo*, Faliscan *pīpafo* 'I shall drink', Irish *-carfa* 'He shall love'. The identity of these Irish formations, however, is disputed, but the languages agree in subjunctives in *a* (Latin *legam*) and *s* (*faxim*) etc. In one respect their sound changes also are very close. As we shall see, the Italic dialects of the Latin stock are distinguished from those of the Oscan and Umbrian stock by retaining *qu* to represent a similar original sound which Oscan, Umbrian and the rest represent by *p*: *quis* in Oscan is *pis*, *quattuor* in Oscan is *petora*. The Keltic languages are similarly divided: Old Irish *cía*, Welsh *prwy*, 'Who?' 'What?'; Old Irish *cethir*, Welsh *pedwar*, Old Welsh *petguar*, 'four'. It is not yet possible to elucidate the reasons for the close relationship of these languages, but it seems clear that, at some period not very remote, they must have lived for long in close contact.

1203. Important, however, as Gaulish influence was upon the Romans and their kinsfolk in Italy, it was far surpassed by that of two other peoples, who were not of Italic origin, and who came into Italy by sea. These were the Greeks and the Etruscans. According to Greek legend, settlements were established by Greeks in Italy soon after the Trojan War. Although authentic history will not carry us so far, there is no doubt that Greeks were settled upon the bay of Naples from a very early period; that whether Cumae, a Chalcidian colony, was as early as the Greeks believed it to be or not, it at any rate communicated a knowledge of the alphabet to the Romans, with whom these Greeks as *socii navales* seem to have been in close connexion from a very early period of Roman history. The Greek words in the Roman vocabulary were most widely borrowed at a later period and from a different Greek stock, as is shown by their vocalism. It is certain that a word like *machina* could not have come from an Ionic colony, which would have had the word in the form *μηχανή*. Only from an Aeolic or Doric colony could the Romans have obtained the form with *a* in the first syllable, and the probability is that it came to them from Tarentum, a Laconian colony, with which they were in close connexion early in the 3rd century B.C. A more recondite example is the curious history of the name of the town *Beneventum*, which came within the range of Roman operations when the Samnites took refuge there after defeat by the Romans in 314 B.C. The early name of the town was *Μαλόεις* (*ponifera*, *malifera*) from *μήλον*, Doric *μάλον*, an apple. The accusative *Μαλόφεντα* with the digamma *f* suggested to the Romans a connexion with the Latin words *Male uentum*, which, being obviously of ill omen, made necessary the change of the name of the city to

Greek.

*Beneventum*. A similar superstition led later to the change of *Epidamnium* (Ἐπίδαμνος taken over in the accusative) to *Dyrrhachium*, which, to a Greek, would have sounded no less sinister. In Roman and Oscan records Greek influence is patent throughout: with the development of a literature at Rome, which was of necessity modelled upon Greek, this influence was much increased. But, though it is less easy to trace, there can be no doubt that the multitude of Greek slaves and Greek freedmen in Rome influenced the language still more.

Greeks in  
Rome.

The Romans were farmers, soldiers, engineers and lawyers; every other department of civilisation was founded on Greek models imported from Greek towns by Greeks. As we learn from Cicero, it was common to keep a Greek philosopher in private families as a sort of domestic chaplain. Under the Empire, as the satirists remind us, this influence in all walks of life was even greater than it had been at an earlier period, and was only accentuated by the advent of Christianity.

1204. The influence of the Etruscans belonged to an earlier period.

Etruscan.

Its beginnings we cannot trace. Recent discoveries go to show that the tradition, recorded by Herodotus (i 94) and others, of the Lydian origin of the Etruscans may contain a kernel of truth. In Etruscan, and in the Oscan and Umbrian alphabets which were borrowed from it, the symbol for **F** is **8**. The usual explanation offered for this symbol is that it represents **⏏**, a closed H, which developed through a double lozenge shape into the figure 8. The Greek alphabet from which the Etruscan was derived had no symbol for the sound *f*: consequently it was represented by the digamma (*ϝ*) followed by *h* to indicate that the sound was not the same as that of Greek **F**. From this **F⏏**, found in the earliest Latin inscription (§ 1210), it has been supposed that, by a process of simplification, **F** was adopted for *f* by Latin, which used **V** for the *ϝ*-sound, while the Etruscans used the *h* symbol. In the Lydian inscriptions, however, which were discovered in 1906, the symbol **8** appears, but, till the Lydian can be read, the occurrence of the same symbol is of course not conclusive evidence for identity of origin. A stone with two inscriptions identical with or akin to Etruscan was found in the island of Lemnos in 1886. The Etruscans, however, were a powerful people in Italy before the date assigned for the foundation of Rome. From the eighth to the fifth century, not only did the Etruscans control Western Italy north of the Tiber, but they also dominated in Campania, their power being first broken by Hiero in the battle of Cumae in 474 B.C. If the origin of this people is still uncertain, their language is no less a mystery. Attempts have been made by various scholars to connect it with all kinds of languages but entirely without success. Until the inscriptions referred to above were discovered recently, Lydian was practically unknown. There are about 8000 Etruscan inscriptions known, but they are almost all short, most being grave-stones containing only

proper names. The oldest are probably not earlier than 600 B.C. In 1892 a book which had been used to pack an Egyptian mummy was identified as Etruscan and published, but without making the language more intelligible. One point however was made clear—that it was altogether impossible to connect Etruscan with Latin, as some distinguished scholars had been arguing in the years immediately preceding. Since then, the longest Etruscan inscription yet discovered, containing about 300 words, has been found at Capua. It is supposed to belong to the fifth century B.C. The commonest characteristics of Etruscan are unlike anything in the neighbouring languages: *clan* is 'son', the common genitive ending is in *-al*. Many names from Greek mythology engraved upon Etruscan works of art imitated from Greek productions show that Etruscan did not have nominative endings in *-s*. Thus Πολυδεύκης appears as *Pultuke*, Μενέλαος as *Menie*. The name so well known as that of the wife of Tarquinius Priscus—Tanaquil—appears as *thanuxvil*, but also as *thanxuvil* and *thanxvil*; Ἀλέξανδρος is *Elxsntré*: from these it is clear that there was a tendency to syncopation and that Etruscan had no objection to great combinations of consonants.

Characteristics  
of Etruscan.

The influence of Etruscan and Latin was reciprocal. If Latin borrowed, as Livy tells us (vii 2), the word *histrío* from the Etruscan *ister*, which corresponded in meaning to the Latin *ludius* 'player', and other words like *idus* and *mantissa*, while it was permeated with Etruscan ideas in various parts of its religion, Etruscan also borrowed from Rome many elements important in ordinary life, none more remarkable perhaps than the name system in *-io*. On the other hand, Latin adopts Etruscan names in *-na*: *Caccina*, *Perpenna*, *Maccenas*, etc.

1205. The relations of Latin and Etruscan are the result of long geographical contiguity and interchange of productions, doubtless also of a period, whether short or long, of Etruscan domination in Rome itself. The relations of Latin to the remaining dialects of Italy are different. Except for a few so-called 'Old Sabellian' inscriptions, the meaning of which is unknown, and which some with little plausibility attribute to an Illyrian tribe penetrating central Italy from the other side of the Adriatic, the dialects of Umbria, of the Paelignians, Marsians, Picentines and all the smaller tribes of central Italy, the speech of the hill tribes of Samnium and of the lowlanders of Campania (with which may be included the little known tribes to the south who, according to Festus, were bilingual, knowing both Oscan and Greek), were all branches of a tongue which must have been in origin the same as Latin and Faliscan. But as, among the Greek dialects, there are various points by which it is possible to identify an Ionic, an Aeolic, or a Doric dialect, so in Italy we find that these kindred dialects break into two groups. The one consists of Latin and Faliscan alone, the other contains the other dialects mentioned. From characteristic

'Old  
Sabellian'.

P and Q  
groups.

(1) below, these dialects can be easily distinguished as the P and Q groups. To the latter belong Latin and Faliscan, to the P group all the rest. Certain criteria definitely distinguish the two groups:

(1) In Latin and Faliscan the Indogermanic sounds  $g^h$  and  $g^w$ , which were guttural sounds produced against the soft palate (the *velum*) and therefore called *velar*, are represented by *qu* and *u* (*gu* when coming after *n*), while in Umbrian, Oscan and the rest they appear as *p* and *b* respectively: *quis*: *pis*; *uiuus*: *bivo*; *uenerit*: *benust*.

(2) The Indogermanic voiced aspirates *bh* and *dh* in all these dialects passed as in Greek into *p-h*, *t-h* (*p* and *t* followed by an audible breath). They then passed, as in modern Greek, into sounds like the English *f* and *th* in *thin* (unvoiced *th*), and *th* passed into *f* at the beginning of words everywhere. In the middle of words it appears as *f* in Oscan, Umbrian etc., but in Latin appears in most cases as *d*, in connexion with *r* as *b*:

Idg.:	* <i>bherō</i> :	Gk	φέρω:	Latin	<i>fero</i> :	Italic	<i>fero</i>
„	: * <i>dhūmos</i> :	„	θυμός:	„	<i>fūmus</i> :	„	<i>fūmus</i>
„	: * <i>medhio-s</i> :	„	(* <i>μεθιος</i> ) μέσος:	„	<i>mediu-s</i> :	„	<i>mefio-s</i>

(3) The combinations of consonants *-kt-* and *-pt-* passed into *-ht-* and *-ft-* and in Umbrian *-ft-* became *-ht-*; *-nkt-* also appears as *-ht-*:

Latin *Octavius*, recte: Oscan, *Ūhtavis*: Umbrian, rehte

„	<i>scriptae</i>	„	<i>scritas</i> :	„	<i>screhito</i>
„	<i>sanctum</i>	„	<i>saahtum</i> :	„	<i>sahtum</i> <sup>1</sup>

(4) *ks* became *ss* or *s*: Latin *dextra*: O. *destrst* (= *dextra est*); U. *destram-e* (with postposition). Cf. also Lat. *iudex* with O. *meddis* (from \**medos* 'law' and *-dic-*), and *meddis*.

(5) *s* remains before nasals in the Italic dialects but is lost in Latin:

Latin	<i>cena</i> :	O.	<i>kersnu</i> :	U.	<i>sesna</i>
„	<i>primus</i> :	Paelignian	<i>prismu</i> .		

(6) *-rs-* became as in Latin *-rr-*, sometimes *-r-*, in Umbrian it remained, or became *-rf-*. L. *terra*; O. *terim* and *teer[um]* 'territorium'; L. *terreo*; U. *tursitu*; L. *Cerus* for *Cerrus* (stem *Ker-s-o-*): U. *cerfe*.

(7) *-nd-* was assimilated to *-nn-*, in Umbrian *-n-*: O. *upsannam*, L. *operandam*, U. *pihaner*, L. *piandi*.

(8) Final *-ns* became in O. *ss*, in U. *f*: O. *viass*, L. *uias*; O. *feihúss*, 'walls'; U. *avif* (acc. pl.), L. *auis*; *manf* (acc. pl.) 'hands'. The participial ending *-nts*, L. *-ns* in *sedens* etc., became *f* in U. *zeřef serse* and possibly elsewhere. The nom. sing. of *-ion-* stems in Oscan was made analogically in *-ns* which became *f*: O. *fruktatiuf*, L. \**fructatio*, O. *úttiuf*, L. \**oitio* from the same root as *utor* (Old Lat. infinitive *oitier*).

(9) Final *ā* passes into *ō*: L. *uia*: O. *viú*.

(10) In the Italic dialects syncope plays a greater part than in Latin. O. *factud* 'facito', U. *ustentu* 'ostendito'. O. *actud* 'agito' is in U. *aitu*,

<sup>1</sup> Where the original records use the native alphabet, the words are given in Roman type, where they use the Latin alphabet, in italics. When a word is preceded by an asterisk, the form is a reconstruction not found in any record.



with a change like that of *L. factum* into French *fait*. Syncope is also common in the last syllable of words, *O. hurz* 'hortus', *U. emps* 'emptus'. The ending of the dat. and abl. pl. in *-bhos*, *L. -bus*, became in *O.* and *U. -fos* and was syncopated: *O. teremniś* 'terminibus', *U. fratrus* 'fratribus' (the *-u-* in the ending is borrowed from the *u-* stems). In Oscan a secondary vowel appears between a nasal or liquid and another consonant, as in *teremniś* just quoted; cp. *Lat. saeculum* which is later than *saeculm*.

(11) In their noun-inflexion these dialects differ from Latin (*a*) by having a living locative case in *o*-stems, which appears as *-ei* in *O.*, *ē* in *U.*: *O. komenei*, *U. kumne*, 'comitio'; (*b*) by retaining *s* in the nom. pl. of *o* and *ā* stems and extending it to the pronouns, whereas in Latin these stems have followed the pronouns in having *oi* (*i*), *ai* (*ae*); (*c*) by retaining the short *-es* in the nom. pl. of consonant stems with later syncopation of the *e*: *O. humuns* *L. hominēs*, *U. frater* (for *frat(e)res*, with assimilation after syncope of a final *s* to the preceding *r*); (*d*) by generalizing the weak forms of stems in *-ion-*: cp. *L. ratiōnem* with *O. tanginom* 'sententiam': *L. natione*, *U. natine*. (*e*) They also both carry *o* forms into the acc. sing. of consonant stems: *O. tangin-om* above; *U. curnaco*, cp. *L. cornicem* with the same meaning. *O.*, but not *U.*, has forms in *-ud* for the ablative: *tanginud*, cp. old *L. Gnaiuod*. (*f*) The genitive in the Italic dialects ends throughout in *-s*, the consonant and *o*-stems having borrowed the *-eis* of *i*-stems: *O. Niumsieis* *L. Numerii*, *U. Marties* *L. Martii*; *O. carneis* 'of a portion', cp. *L. carnis* originally the same word, the meaning 'flesh' developing through 'portion of meat'; *U. nomner* *L. nominis* which has lost the weak form of the stem preserved in Umbrian. *O.* and *U.* do not have the new gen. pl. of Latin in *-ōrum*.

(12) In the verb the chief differences between *O.* and *U.* and *L.* are: (*a*) Futures in *-s-* instead of futures in *-b-*: *O. deiust* 'iurabit', *U. pruphest* 'ante piabit'; (*b*) future perfects in *-ust*: *O. peremust* 'peremerit', *refacust* 'fecerit': *U. andirsafust* 'circumdederit', *benurent* (*r* for *s*) 'uenerint'; (*c*) instead of the *L.* perfect in *-ui*, *amaui* etc. *O.* and *U.* have five different verb formations in *f*, *t*, *l*, *nk*, and the personal endings added to the noun stems: *O. uupsens* from *\*opsā* syncopated from the same stem as *L. opera* with the secondary ending for 3 pl.; (*d*) a variety of imperative forms not found in Latin; (*e*) the infinitive in *-om* instead of *-ere*: *O. deikum* 'dicere', *U. a(n)-fero(m)* 'circumferre'; (*f*) forms of the passive with *-er* as well as *-or* and *-ur* (Umbrian), *O. sakarater* 'sacratur'; (*g*) verb stems in *-ā* have the participle in *-ēto*: *O. prūftū-* syncopated from *\*profēto* *L. probato*, *U. oseto* for *\*opsetū* *L. operata*. From the nature of the documents, pluperfect subjunctives are not found. The perfect subj. is much used, some forms like *hipid* 'habuerit' not occurring in Latin.

1206. The documents for the study of Umbrian (as of Oscan and the minor dialects) are very small in bulk. Much the longest and most important, though also the most difficult to understand, are the seven Eugubine Tables of ritual for a brotherhood at the

Umbrian.

ancient Iguvium, the modern Gubbio. These are beautifully engraved on bronze. They were discovered in 1444 A.D., but their interpretation made very little progress till the nineteenth century. The greater part of them is written in a native alphabet borrowed from Etruscan, the latter part in Latin letters. The date is uncertain; the parts in the Latin alphabet are later than the rest, but the last part is probably not later than the first century

Oscan.

B.C. The Oscan inscriptions are much shorter but present greater variety. The most carefully engraved of them is the

*Cippus Abellanus* containing a treaty for the joint use of a temple by the inhabitants of Nola and Abella. The longest is the *Tabula Bantina* from Bantia in the south of Italy, part of a body of municipal law. The *Tabula Agnonensis* contains a list of statues and altars in a sacred grove at Agnone. From Capua come a considerable number of inscriptions, dedications and *devotiones*, the most important of the latter being the 'Curse of Vibia' which resembles the Latin *dirae* and well-known inscriptions in Greek and other languages. A variety of short inscriptions come from Pompeii. Systematic excavation, such as is carried on in Greece, would no doubt vastly increase the number of Oscan inscriptions

Campanian  
influence in  
Rome.

in a short time. The Campanians, till their ruin in the Hannibalic war, had a higher civilisation than the Romans and very probably possessed a literature. The dramatic performances of Atella, an Oscan town, were carried to

Rome, where no doubt they were performed in Latin. But, as there was a large Italian population in the city—the influx was so great after 200 B.C. that the Roman government to secure the proper quota of troops from the Italian towns had to insist that some member of each family should remain in his native town—it is not improbable that there may have been, as in Tyrol, a *Bauer-Theater* with performances in the rustic tongue. It is possible that Titinius quoted by Festus (s.v. *Obscum*) may be referring to such things when he speaks of those *Qui Obsce et Volsce jabulantur, nam Latine nesciunt*. Be this as it may, the careful spelling and engraving of their inscriptions, the precise differentiation of sounds, and the invention of devices like *i* for an open *i* sound and of *û* for *o*, which did not exist in the Etruscan alphabet borrowed by them, indicate a greater grammatical competence than existed at the time in Rome. The remains of the other

Minor  
dialects.

dialects are very scanty: there is one inscription of six lines in Paelignian and several shorter, one of four lines in Volscian, one of 36 words in Marrucinian. Of Sabine, which,

from its historical connexion with Rome, ought to have been the most interesting of all, only a few words are preserved, to which may be added a considerable number quoted as Sabine by Varro, Festus, or other grammarians.

## OSCAN.

i. From the *Cippus Abellanus* 40—48; in native alphabet.

Ekkum svai pīd Abellanūs  
tribarakattuset iūk tri-  
barakkiuf inīm ūttiuf  
Abellanūm estud. Avt  
pūst feihūis pūs fīsnam am-  
fret, eisei terei nep Abel-  
lanūs nep Nūvlanūs pidum  
tribarakattins

Item si quid Abellani  
aedificauerint, id aedi-  
ficium et usus  
Abellanorum esto. At  
post muros qui fanum amb-  
iunt, in eo territorio nec Abel-  
lani nec Nolani quidquam  
aedificauerint.

tribarakattuset 3 pl. fut. pft, made with an obsolete pft act. participle (tribarakattus from a *t-* pft) and a subj. with short vowel of the substantive verb (set = *sent* 3 pl.); tribarakattins is 3 pl. pft subj. The stem of these words is a compound of *trēbo-* 'house' and *arak-* as in *arx* and *arceo*; thus tribarakkiuf 'house fencing', 'building'. iūk = *ea-ce*. tribarakkiuf nom. sing. fem. for -iōns. pūst governs the abl. in O. and U., cp. L. *post hac*. pūs nom. pl. with *s* borrowed from noun inflexion. fīsnam has the meaning of *fanum*, but the form of the root seen in L. *feriae* older *fēsiai*. amfr-et 3 pl. from a 1st person sing. \*amfr-eo, amfr- stands to L. *amb-* in *ambages* etc. as *super* does to *sub*. The verb is declined as if it were of the second conjugation, like L. *monéo*. eisei terei locative. nep—nep like L. *nec—nec*; cp. § 1214.

## ii. From Messana.

σθενis καλινis σταττιης  
μαρας πομπτιης νινμυδιης  
μεδδειζ ουπσευς  
εινεμ τωστο μαμερτινο  
αππελλουνη σακορο

Stenius Calinius Statii f.  
Mara Pontius Numerii f.  
meddices fecerunt  
et ciuitas Mamertina  
Apollini sacra.

## iii. From the Tabula Bantina 18—20; in Latin alphabet.

Pon censur |  
Bansae toutam censaset pis ceus Bantins  
fust, censamur esuf in. eituam poizad  
ligud |  
iusc censur censaum angetuzet

Cum censores  
Bantiae populum censebunt, qui cuius Bantinus  
erit, censetor ipse et pecuniam qua lege

ii censores censere proposuerint

censur for \**censlōrēs* with syncope and assimilation of *s*. Bansae; Bantiae with assimilation of *t* by following *i* pronounced as *y*. censaset, 3 pl. future. censamur, 3 sing. imp. pass. (followed by acc. of respect eituam). censaum, infinitive from a verb stem *censā-* not *censē-* as in Latin. ceus syncopated for *ceiuis*. esuf possibly for \**epsōns* connected with *ipse* (Buck § 197. 5). poizad, from the stem *quo-* with an added element of uncertain origin. angetuzet, etymology uncertain.

## UMBRIAN.

## i (tab. vii a 20).

Ennom persciu eso deitu:  
Prestota Šerfia Šerfer Martier,  
tiom isir uesclir adrir, tiom  
plener poplu-per totar liouinar,  
totaper | liouina, erer nomneper,  
erar nomneper. Prestota Šerfia  
Šerfer Martier, tiom subocauu.  
Prestotar | Šerfiar Šerfer Martier  
foner frite tiom subocauu. Ennom  
uesticatu, ahatripursatu.

## Buck's translation.

Tum precatione sic dicito:  
Praestita Cerria Cerri Martii,  
te his uasculis atris, te  
plenis pro populo ciuitatis Iguinae,  
pro ciuitate Iguina, pro populi nomine  
pro ciuitatis nomine. Praestita Cerria  
Cerri Martii, te inuoco.  
Praestitae Cerriae Cerri Martii  
fauentis fiducia te inuoco. Tum  
libato, aps-tripodato.

One of the prayers offered to Praestita Cerria at Rubinia, after three red or black pigs had been sacrificed. *persclu* from the same root as L. *posco*. The suffix was originally *-tlo-* but in all Italic dialects it became *-clo-*, cp. L. *saeclum*, this form being older than *saeculum*. *eso(c)*, *esuk* is the full form of the adverb. *Sersia* from a stem \**Ker(ē)s-io-*. *tiom*=L. *tē*+noun acc. suffix in *-om*. *vesclir* from \**ves+kelo-* diminutive suffix, different from the suffix in *persclu*. *adrir*. In L. *-dr-* becomes *-tr-*, cp. *uter, utris* 'water-bottle', from the same root as *ὕδωρ*. *erer* gen. masc. for *populi*, U. *popler*; *erir* gen. fem. for U. *totar*, 'state'. *nomne*, weak grade of the stem not preserved in Latin except in *carne*. *per* is a weakened form of *pro*: *p̄r* (where *r* is the syllabic *r*), cp. the change in L. *sacer* from *sakros* through *sakr* (with final *s* assimilated). *subocauu* 1 sing. pres. ind. of \**subuoco*, *u* being assimilated to *b*, and the ending *ō* (*u*) being added to the stem without contraction as in L., the first *u* acting as glide between the two vowels, cp. U. *tuva* acc. neut. of *duo*. *joner*, nom. pl. of a *-ni-* stem from the root of *fauco*. *frite*, a locative or abl. from a stem *frēt-*, cp. L. *fretus*. *uesticatu*, imperat.; von Planta conjectures that as *l* in Umbrian becomes *v* before a vowel, this word may be connected with L. *libare*, comparing for the formation L. *masticare* as related to *mandere*.

## ii. In native alphabet.

Table v a 22.

Et ape frater çersnatur furent,  
ehvelklu feia fratreks ute  
kvestur, sve rehte kuratu si.  
Sve mestru karu | fratu Atiieřiu,  
pure ulu benurent, | prusikurent  
rehte kuratu eru, eřek | prufe si.  
Sve mestru karu fratu Atiieřiu,  
pure ulu benurent, prusikurent |  
kuratu rehte neip eru, enuk fratu ||  
ehvelklu feia fratreks | ute kvestur,  
panta muta ařferture si.

Buck's translation.

Et ubi fratres cenati erunt,  
sententiam roget magister aut  
quaestor, si recte curatum sit.  
Si maior pars fratrum Atiediorum,  
qui illuc uenerint, pronuntiauerint  
recte curatum esse, id probe sit.  
Si maior pars fratrum Atiediorum,  
qui illuc uenerint, pronuntiauerint  
curatum recte non esse, tum fratrum  
sententiam roget magister aut quaestor,  
quanta multa flamini sit.

Ape apparently for *ad+pe*=L. *at-que*, but different in usage. *çersnatur*, nom. pl. of ptep., *-ur=-ōs*. *furent*, 3 pl. of fut. of \**fū-*, cp. L. *forent* for formation, both being 1 aor. subj. with a short vowel. *ehvelklu*, from the same root as L. *uolo*, *-klu*, suffix as in *persclu*. *eh-* preposition. *feia* possibly for \**fēkiāt*, *k* disappearing before *y*, with long form of root seen in *fačia*. *fratreks*, the 'grand master' of the brotherhood. *mestru*, from a stem \**mag-is-tero*—with two comparative suffixes, whence *maist(ero)*—and *ai* changed to *e*. *pure*, nom. pl. O. *pús*+enclitic. *ulu*, an adv. in *-ō* from the stem seen in L. *ōlim*. *benurent*, 3 pl. fut. pft. *prusikurent*, 3 pl. pft. subj. from the same root as L. *inseque* 'say'; *i* for *ē* as in perfects like L. *cepi, feci*. *eru(m)*, infin. \**esom*. *eřek*, O. idic. *neip* would be in L. \**ni-que*; there is a common corresponding use of *nec* for *non* in legal Latin. *ařferture*, literally in Latin \**adjertori* 'offerer'.

1207. These dialects, at first sight, seem even more remote from Latin than they really are, (a) from the fact that their alphabets

Conspicuous  
differences  
from Latin.

are different from the Latin alphabet, (b) because phonetic changes have carried Latin in a different direction from Oscan, which keeps the original diphthongs and retains *s* between vowels, while Latin except in a few words changes it everywhere into *r*: O. *asa*, L. *ara*; O. *egmazum* 'of things', cp. L. *mensarum*. (c) Umbrian, by loss of diphthongs and final consonants, is much more broken down than either Latin or Oscan. By its turning of *k* before *i* into a sibilant: U. *fačia*, L. *faciat*, by the palatalisation of *g* before *t*:



aitu, L. *agito*, and between vowels: Iiuvina, L. *Iguuinā* (abl. fem.), and by the loss of *l* before *t*: muta, L. *multa* 'fine', Umbrian seems to anticipate the developments found in some of the Romance languages. Its change of *d* between vowels into a sound written in Latin alphabet with *rs*: *perse*, L. *pede*, and its strange perfect and imperative forms, increase the apparent differences. On the other hand, it carries rhotacism much farther than Latin and agrees with it also in making the ablative sing. of consonant stems in *e*: natine, L. *natione*. A special peculiarity of Paelignian is the use in one inscription of a symbol D which apparently represents a voiced *th* (ð) as in English *then*.

1208. Of Faliscan, the only one of the dialects which is closely connected with Latin (1) by its use of *qu* as compared with *p* in the other dialects, and (2) by the possession of futures in *f* like the Latin in *b*, we know very little. The position of Falerii suggests that it was an early outpost of the Latin stock thrust into Etruscan territory; its sounds and forms appear to confirm this. Its alphabet is different from the Latin alphabet, its final consonants are often lost and it clearly has been much influenced by its Etruscan neighbour. Its characteristics may be seen from the following inscriptions:

1. Vibia Zertenea loferta | Marci Acarcelini mate he cupa.

[Vibia Z. a freedwoman the mother of M. A. lies here (*mater hic cubat*).]

2. Foied uino pipafo cra carefo.

[Today I shall drink wine, tomorrow I shall go without.]

As in Etruscan, *b* is not found, *p* being used instead. The forms *loferta*, *pipafo*, and *carefo* with medial *f* distinguish the dialect from Latin. The Faliscans seem to have tended to confuse voiced and unvoiced consonants, having, though not uniformly, *z* for *s*, and in a presentation from a guild of Faliscans settled in Sardinia *g* for *c*, *Gonlegium*, *Volgani* (*Vulcani*).

1209. As the literature which has survived to us from ancient Italy is entirely Roman, we naturally think of Rome as the source of Latin. But as Rome was a border town, with Etruscans beyond the Tiber separated from it only by a mile or two, while the Sabines who belonged to the other Italian stock were not very far away, it is only reasonable to suppose that other Latins in early times may have looked upon it with no less contempt than Rome showed for the language of the Praenestines in Plautus' time. Schulze in his great work on Latin proper names argues that the earliest Latin tribes *Ramnes*, *Titius* and *Luceres* were all Etruscan, and that the very name of Rome was Etruscan. In a later age we know that Rome contained a *Vicus Tuscus* occupied mainly by Etruscan tradesfolk. According to tradition, the second king of Rome was a Sabine, and his name *Pompilius* confirms the legend, for its nearest equivalent in Latin would be *Quinctilius*, just as *Quintius* is the Latin corresponding to the Campanian *Pontius*. Roman

Faliscan.

Latin.

Etruscan  
influence  
in Rome.

Sabine  
influence  
in Rome.

'fried fish shops' in later times had an Oscan name, *popinae*, for which the Latin was *coquinae*. In classical Latin this was replaced by *culina*, a word from the same root (= \**coc-s-lina*), but *coquina* must have existed side by side with it all the time, for while English has borrowed *kiln* from *culina*, it has taken over *coquina* in the form *kitchen*. The common word *bos*, 'ox', *βοῦς*, was not Latin, for the original initial velar *g*, represented by *c* in English *cow*, would have appeared in Latin as consonant *u*: cp. *uenio*, *βαίω*, *come*. That it should be Sabine or Oscan is not more surprising than that the English *egg* should be Norse, or that *vixen*, a dialect form from the west, should be used as the feminine to *fox*. The dialect influence is shown curiously in the word *Subura*, a district where many foreigners lived. The official abbreviation for *Subura* was always *svc.* where *c* is the old form for *g*. Cp. Festus: *Subura regio Romae a pago Succusano vocabulum traxit quod ei uicinum fuit*. This follows Varro (*de lingua latina* v 48) who says: <ego a> *pago potius Succusano dictam puto Succusam; nunc scribitur tertia littera C, non B. Pagus Succusanus, quod succurrit carinis*. The word dates from before 350 B.C., as is shown by the intervocalic *s*; the false derivation accounts for the spelling with *cc*. Another characteristic which seems to have been derived from Sabine is the change of *d* into *l* sporadically in Latin: *lacrima* for *dacrima* which Festus tells us was used by Livius Andronicus, *lingua* for *dingua* Eng. *tongue*, though here *l* may have been influenced by *lingo* 'lick', *casilam* for *cassidem*, *nouensiles* according to Bréal from *nouo* + *insides* (cp. *reses*) 'newly settled'.

Words with medial *f* can never be genuine Latin words, though which of the other dialects gave them origin cannot always be ascertained. Thus *bufo*, *rufus*, *scrofa*, *sulfur*, *uaser* and other less well-known words cannot be originally Latin. The Latin equivalent of *rufus*, viz. *robus*, survived in ritual phrases and is found in the literature only in Juvenal, viii 155 *dum lanatas robumque iuuenem | more Numae caedit*. Otherwise *ruber* took its place, with *rufus* and *rutilus*, both specially of hair, as auxiliaries. When Latin came to be used in districts which had previously used another dialect, traces of the old dialect appear in the Latin.

1210. Of all the varieties of dialectic Latin Praenestine is the best known to us. From Praeneste comes probably the oldest of all Latin inscriptions (about 600 B.C.)

Praenestine  
Latin.

#### MANIOS MED FHE FHAKED NVMASIOI

which is engraved from right to left upon a golden *fibula* found in 1886<sup>1</sup>. It represents the classical Latin *Manius me fecit Numerio*. The letters are still Chalcidian Greek and consequently, as *ϕ* is the Greek *Digamma* (= *w*) not the Latin *f*, *Η* is added to represent the unvoiced character of the Latin *s* as compared with the Greek sound. The reduplicated perfect *fefaked* is possibly a Praenestine peculiarity, Roman Latin having regularly *fecit*, *fecid*, *fecit*. In *Numasioi*, as in *fefaked*, *a* is not weakened to *i* (to *e* before *r*)

<sup>1</sup> See facsimile on p. 731 *supra*.

as it would have been at Rome: cp. *cecidit* from *cado*, and *Numerius*. Intervocalic *s* has not yet become *r*, and the old ending of the dative *-ōi* still remains. If the statement of Paulus, the epitomator of Festus, is correct that the Greek *νεφρούς* was represented at Lanuvium by *nebrundines* and at Praeneste by *nefrones*, the *f* of the Praenestine form must have arisen under Sabine influence, which may perhaps be traced also in *Foratia* for *Horatia*, since the grammarians tell us that the Sabines said *fasena* for *harena*, *fedus* for *haedus*, *fircus* for *hircus*, *foctis* for *hostis*, *folus* for *holus*, *fordeum* for *hordeum* etc. On the other hand, in such words, rustic Latin generally dropped initial *h*, having *edus* for *haedus*, *ircus* for *hircus*, *arena* for *harena*, and no doubt *ordeum* for *hordeum*, cp. French *orge*. We learn also that the Praenestines said *conea* for *ciconia* (Plaut. *Trin.* 691), *medidies* for *meridies* (Varro, *L.L.* vi 4), and used *tammodo* in the sense of *ilico* (Plaut. *Trin.* 609), *tongitio* in the sense of *notio* (Paulus, ep. of Festus). The form *losna* appears in an inscription on a mirror, a partial assimilation of the older \**louksnā*, from which *luna* comes. The loss of final *s*, *m*, *t*, *nt*; the genitive in *-us*: *Salutus*; the dat. in *e* where Latin has *i*: *Hercole*; the nom. pl. of *-o*-stems in *-eis*: *magistreis*, which is borrowed from *i*-stems, it shares with many other forms of dialectic Latin. In the inscription *Q. K. Cestio Q. f. | Hercule donu | d]edero* it is possible that *Cestio* may be a dual; two brothers Quintus and Kaeso of the Cestius family, sons of Quintus, gave a gift to Hercules. It may, however, stand for *Cestios* with lost final, in the singular, though Roman Latin in such a case would use the plural *Cestii*.

**1211.** But, within the bounds of Latium as defined by the geographers, not only was there variety of dialect as at Praeneste, or Volscian. Lanuvium or Norba, but at least half of the territory was occupied by the Volscians who spoke a language of the P-stock, the scanty remains of which resemble Umbrian more closely than Oscan. According to ancient tradition the Latins were identical with the *Siculi* of Sicily, who had been driven out of Italy by irruptions of The Sicels. the Campanian stock (Thucydides, vi 2, 4). Sprung from Rome according to Varro (*L.L.* v 100), the Sicels had a word *λέπορις* for the hare, like the Latin *lepus*, *leporis*, *κάρινον* was a dish like Lat. *catinum* but used differently (v 120), *nummi* was a Sicel word (v 173) for silver coins (Gk *νόμοι* and *νόμμοι*), and *μοῖτρον* a loan like the Latin *mutuum* (v 179).

Volscian.

*deue* : declune : statom : *sepis* :  
*atahus* : *pis* : *uelestrom* | *faxia* :  
*esaristrom* : .....  
*ec* : *se* : *cosuties* : *ma* : *ca* :  
*tafanies* : *medix* : *sistiatiens*

Diuae \**Declonae* statum. Siquis  
attigerit quis Veliternorum, faciat  
sacrificium.  
Ec. Cossutius Se. f., Ma.  
Tafanius Ca. f. meddices statuerunt

*atahus* = *ad-tetahust* a fut. perf. (v. Planta). *esaristrom* a derivative from \**aisar* 'deus', cp. \**aisos* sacrum. The father's name comes between the *praenomen* and the *nomen*; Ec. probably *Egnatius*, Se. *Servius*, Ma. *Mara* as in Oscan, Ca. *Gaius*. *sistiatiens*, apparently a perfect in *t* from a stem *sistā*.

Paelignian.

... | *t. nounis.* | *l. alafis.* *c* | *herec. fesn* | *upsaseter* | *coisatens*

...T. Nonius . . L. Alfius C. f. Herculi fanum operaretur curaverunt

*upsaseter* in sense of *fieret*; observe the jussive subj. where Latin would more probably have put *aedificandum* or the like; but cp. Hor. *Sat.* ii 6. 38 *imprimat his cura Maecenas signa tabellis*.

**1212.** Apart from the very old Praenestine inscription the other very early remains of Latin have been found in or near Rome itself. Roman Latin. These are: (a) the inscription probably not later than the fifth century B.C. found on a broken pyramidal stone in the Forum excavations of 1899<sup>1</sup>. Its meaning cannot be clearly ascertained because, the lines being written alternately from the bottom upwards and from the top downwards, the loss of the upper part of the stone makes every line incomplete. In this inscription we find *k* still in ordinary use: *kalatorem*, *kapia* (*capiat*), while *c* is still *c* in *recei* (*regi*); *quoi* is used for the nominative *qui*; *sakros* has not yet been changed to *sacer*; the *x* of *iouxmenta* has not been assimilated, nor its *ou* for earlier *eu* (cp. ζεύς) changed to *ū* as in *iumentum*; *dioxestod*, it is suggested, is the archaic form for *iustō* (abl. sing.). (b) An inscription probably of the second half of the fourth century B.C., scratched on a little pot which was found on the Quirinal in 1880<sup>2</sup>. This is generally known as the Duenos inscription, because the most intelligible part of it is **DVENOS MED FECED**. There are no spaces between the words, of which there are about 30; consequently the exact wording and the general interpretation are much disputed. (c) The next sources of which the upper limit of date can be ascertained are the inscriptions on the tombs of the Scipios, the oldest being originally painted on and afterwards engraved<sup>3</sup>. None of these can be earlier than the first half of the third century B.C., the earliest inscription being on the tomb of L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus who died in 298 B.C. The epitaph in its present form is probably at least forty years later. The inscriptions of the Scipios who died in 298 B.C. and 259 B.C. respectively show a loss of final consonants in *Cornelio(s)*, *omne(m)*, *oino(m)*, *duonoro(m)*, etc., and loss of *n* before *s* in *cosentiont*, *cosol*, *cesor*. But as *consol* and *ensor* also each occur twice, it is probable that the preceding vowel was nasalised as in French. The diphthong *ai* remains in *Gnaivod*, *aidilis*, *aide(m)*, *oi* has not yet become *oe* or *u* in *oino(m)*, *ou* for both prehistoric *eu* and *ou* has not passed into *u* in *abdoucit* and *Loucanam*, but on both inscriptions the man's name is *Lucius*; *d* remains in the abl. of *o*-stems: *Gnaivod*; the dat. of *virtus* ends in *-ei*, the nom. pl. of *plurimus* is *pleirume*; *quei* is nom. *quouis* gen. of the relative; *hic* and *hec* stand side by side, possibly with the same meaning, though *hic* might be adverb; *fuet*, *cepit*, *dedet* are found in the same inscription; consonants are not yet

<sup>1</sup> Facsimile on p. 732 *supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Facsimile on p. 733 *supra*.

<sup>3</sup> Facsimiles on pp. 734—736 *supra*.



doubled: *parisuma*, *fuise*; *duonoro(m)* is the later *bonorum*, cp. *duellum* later *bellum* (from a disyllabic *dwellum*); the name Duilius is found elsewhere as Bilius (cp. Cicero, *Orator* 153 with Sandys's note). The forms *duonoro* and *ploirume* show that the change of *s* to *r* between vowels had already taken place. The change took place between 450 B.C. and 350 B.C. Varro quotes *asas*, *Valesios*, *Fusios* (more correctly *Fousios*) as the old forms of *aras*, *Valerios*, *Furios*, and elsewhere *fesiis* for *feriis*, *loebesum* for *liberum*, *maiosibus*, *meliosibus* etc. are quoted. (d) The fragments of the Laws of the Twelve Tables come down from 450 B.C., but are preserved to us in documents of the first century B.C., or later; though obviously archaic, their form therefore is not that of the period when they were compiled. (e) The original inscription on the *columna rostrata* recording the victory of Duilius over the Carthaginians belonged to 260 B.C., but the existing form of it is a restoration of the first century A.D.<sup>1</sup> (f) The very ancient hymn of the Arval brethren is found in a very corrupt form dating from 218 A.D.<sup>2</sup>

1213. The form of the language even in its earliest recorded period is very different from that of Greek. The chief cause for this difference was in the nature of the accent of the two Latin accent. languages. In Greek the accent was *pitch*, the voice rising and falling in different syllables or, with the circumflex accent, in the same syllable, producing a sing-song cadence. In Latin, however, the accent was, as in English, *stress*; one syllable in a word was pronounced with more force than the other syllables. Consequently the unaccented syllables tended to disappear altogether; if they did not disappear, they were pronounced indistinctly. The original position of the Latin accent was upon the first syllable of the word, no matter how long it might be; in later times, however, it was confined to the penultimate or antepenultimate syllable of long words, standing on the former if long, on the antepenultimate if the penult was short. The forms of the oldest part of the Latin vocabulary were the effect of accent upon the first syllable. Thus *incipio* could not have arisen at the time when the three-syllable law prevailed, for the accent of Latin in historical times would have been upon the second syllable, so that *\*incipio* would have remained without changing *a* to *i*; and the different treatment of vowels and diphthongs in compounds (1215) would not have arisen. The effect of stress was to shorten syllables both before and after the accent. Thus, in the period of the three-syllable law, *offella* arose from *offa*, accent being then on the middle syllable. The most noticeable effect on post-accentual syllables is seen in the law of *Breues Breuiantes* where a short accented syllable tends to be followed by another short syllable. Thus *bene* and *male* shorten final *e*, which, as a rule, in adverbs of this type is long. All unaccented medial short vowels tend to become *i*, or, if followed by *l*, *u*, while *e* (not *i*) stands before *r*; *facio*, *efficio*, but *salto*, *insulto*; *tenet*, *retinet*, but *fero*, *differo*; *locus*, *ilico* (on the spot); but *dolus*, *sedulo*. Final *i*

<sup>1</sup> Partial facsimile on p. 749.<sup>2</sup> Cp. p. 759 § 1128 *supra*.

passes into *e*: *facilis* but *facile*; so also *o* becomes *e*, if *ipse* stands for earlier \**ipso*.

**1214.** The second period of Latin, from 240 B.C. to 90 B.C., contains not only many inscriptions of all kinds, but also a considerable mass of literature which we know to be only a small fraction of all that existed. Besides the plays of Plautus and Terence we possess a large number of fragments (mostly very short) of other poets. The language however remained in a state of flux; archaic and new spellings of words are found even in the same inscription. The first Roman philologist was L. Aelius Stilo of Lanuvium who was born about 154 B.C.<sup>1</sup> But, before him, literary men had attempted to improve the methods of recording the language; Ennius introduced double consonants, Lucilius attempted to make a distinction between the gen. sing. and nom. pl. of masculine *o*-stems

by spelling the genitive with *-i*, the plural with *-ei*, and similarly the datives *illi* and *uni* with *i*, but *illei* nom. pl.; Accius tried to introduce the Oscan fashion of doubling a vowel to represent a long vowel. But Lucilius' and Accius' improvements were not able to hold their ground<sup>2</sup>. In the literary language final *s* and *m* were restored in spelling, but in colloquial language were not pronounced, as is clear from the scansion of Plautus, *s* disappearing occasionally at the end of short syllables even before a following vowel (Leo's law) and *m* regularly disappearing before vowels. It has also been shown that disyllables like *ille*, *iste*, *nempe* in Plautus are monosyllables, *e* being lost before consonants, as appears also in *nec* for *neque*, *ac* for *atque*, etc. Between the language of literature and the language of ordinary conversation a rift began, which, as time went on, steadily widened. In this period there were extensive borrowings from Greek, but Latin sounds were substituted for Greek. Thus Πύρρος became *Burrus*, Φρύγες *Bruges*, Κόρινθος *Corintus*. In this period many changes took place in Latin. Many old forms died out or were retained only in legal or poetical language. Thus by the end of the period old subjunctives used as future perfects like *leuasso* had given place to *leuauero* (*leuaro*); *faxo*, a similar form, and *faxim* the perfect subjunctive, originally an optative, maintained a precarious existence. But their true history was forgotten, and Cicero could explain the similar 2nd person *capsis* as standing for *cape si uis*, a statement which received some plausibility from the fact that *sodes* 'if you please' really stood for *si audes* in colloquial language (*Orator* 154). The old genitive plural of *o*-stems in *-um*: *deum*, *uirum* etc. gradually gives way before the new form in *-orum*, which had come in earlier (by analogy) from the pronouns. Some forms in common use like *sestertium* lingered on, but in the first century B.C. the origin of this word is so far forgotten that it is treated as a neuter singular, and from Cicero onwards is used both in the abl. sing. *sestertio* and in the plural *sestertia*. The final *d* in the ablative which originally belonged to the *o*-stems was attached also to others: *sententiad*, *airid* and even

<sup>1</sup> § 1239 *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> p. 730 *supra*.

*facilumed* but, early in the period, *-d* after a long vowel had disappeared. The infinitive in *-ier*, used by Virgil to give an archaic effect, is found in both verse and prose: *gnoscier*, *utier*, *auocarier*. Many irregularities appear, in both formation and syntax, partly because the language had not yet been reduced to a uniform system, partly because Latin was spreading very rapidly in Italy and being employed by speakers and writers who had grown up in the use of other dialects. Inscriptions from outside Latium naturally bear marks of their origin. But the most important authors, Plautus, Terence, Ennius, were not Romans nor even Latins by birth, and in days when systematic teaching of grammar did not exist, it might be expected, as with the English of Adam Smith, Hume and Robertson in the eighteenth century, that the writers should occasionally betray their non-native origin. According to Roman tradition, however, Terence's work was supervised by the younger Scipio Africanus and his circle, while Plautus is always regarded as writing excellent Latin. The irregularities of concord in Plautus, e.g. a singular verb with two subjects, or a plural verb with 'A cum B', as Prof. Lindsay puts it, are colloquialisms equally common in English. The locative is used more extensively than in classical Latin, and the classical rule for the use of prepositions with the names of places is not strictly adhered to. In the same passage Plautus often varies in the sequence of tenses. As a rule he begins with a subordinate clause in a secondary tense and follows it up by another with a primary tense, on the same principle which makes him always pass in a long narrative into the historical present. The future perfect has often the same value as the ordinary future. Similarly the pluperfect has often the same meaning as the aoristic perfect. The perfect infinitive is more used than later, till it was revived for metrical reasons by the elegiac poets. It is specially common in the legal style: *nei quis eorum Bacanal habuisse uelet* (Sctum de Bacchanalibus 4)<sup>1</sup>. In double prohibitions and wishes, the original negative was no doubt *neque—neque*, not *neue—neue* as in classical Latin, since such sentences are not alternative, as positive commands or wishes may be, but cumulative (cp. μήτε—μήτε in Greek and nep—nep (= *neque—neque*) in Oscan: nep deikum nep fatium pútiad (= *nec dicere nec fateri possit*)). But by Plautus' time *ne—neue*, occasionally *ne—niue*, is much the commoner construction though the other is also found. So, in an inscription from a sacred grove near Spolegium: *honce loucom nequ[i]s uiolatod | neque exuehito neque exferito quod louci siet*. The usages of the subjunctive vary considerably: a subordinate question may be in the indicative: *dic quis est*, Bacchides 558. In causal and concessive sentences the indicative is common. In unreal conditions Plautus uses primary tenses more frequently than secondary, while the contrary is true of classical Latin. When Plautus uses a sentence of the type *si habuissem, dedissem*, he generally means that the 'having' and the 'giving' were not contemporaneous (Lindsay). If the protasis and apodosis refer to the same time, the protasis as a rule

<sup>1</sup> Cp. last paragraph of p. 757 *supra*.

is in the imperfect. The earliest form of the future infinitive is indeclinable and without *esse*, according to Dr Postgate's explanation, because it is already compounded of a supine with an old infinitive of the substantive verb *erom* (as in Umbrian), *futurum* standing for *futu + erom*.

**1215.** The third period in the development of Latin may be taken as extending from 90 B.C. to the end of the pre-Christian era. To it belong, not only a steadily increasing number of inscriptions, but also the greatest extant works of Roman literature. In the first half of this period the most important figures are Lucretius the last representative of the old-fashioned school, Catullus the first poet of the new, Cicero the greatest artist in Latin prose and the chief founder of Latin prose style, Sallust the archaising historian, Caesar the representative of the plain style. With the death of Virgil and Horace this period may be regarded as coming to an end. Many authorities would divide the period into two by separating the republican writers from those whose chief activity was under Augustus. But with Cicero and Virgil the language, as a literary medium, reaches a fixed form, and the difference amongst these writers, excepting Lucretius, is one rather of temperament than of language. Cicero represents in his own person nearly all sides of Roman literature. His early verses of no great merit, curiously enough, as Munro showed, were the model followed by Lucretius, who continues to elide final -s like the writers of the previous period though with much less frequency. The last phrase in Catullus *tu dabi' supplicium* is his sole example, and the later writers do not employ it. Lucretius complains bitterly of the poverty of his native tongue in philosophical expressions, and he and Cicero between them had to create a philosophical language. All the resources of Roman rhetoric are utilised in the treatises on Oratory, more especially in the *de Oratore*. The Speeches illustrate the more polished side of the language used in the lawcourts. The Letters exemplify all forms of expression, from a practical guide to a candidate for election, through formal and polite communications with important contemporaries, to the genuine unstudied letter addressed to friends like Atticus, Caelius or Trebatius. Cicero himself makes Crassus remark in the *de Oratore* (iii 45) that the idiomatic Latin of an old Roman lady—born about 150 B.C.—reminded him of Plautus and Naeuius. The language of his more familiar letters, couched in the conversational idiom of the day, contains many things that remind the reader of the Roman comedy, though perhaps the likeness has been somewhat exaggerated by Prof. Tyrrell in his Introduction to the Letters. These letters, however, are the best source for a knowledge of educated every day talk in Cicero's time, just as those of Caelius give us the more slangy style of a young man about town. The language has now all the characteristics which remain typical of it. The diphthongs are established in their final form for the classical period: *ai* has become *ae* (*i* when unaccented: *laedo, illudo*), *ei*

Roman Latin.

The Golden Age.

Different types of classical Latin.



has passed to *i* (this had taken place in the previous period, but the old spelling *ei* then remained), *oi* has passed into *ū* when accented, *ī* when not accented: *unus* (*oinos*), *domini* (n. pl. for *dominoi*); *eu*, changed, before the history of Latin begins, to *ou*, has along with original *ou* become *ū*; *au* alone remains in the cultivated language in its original form when accented, in unaccented syllables it had become *ū*, while Latin still always accented the first syllable: *claudio*, *include*. In the vulgar tongue *au* has become *ō*; hence, when the aristocratic foe of Cicero wishes to become a tribune of the people, he must change *Claudius* to *Clodius*, though his son, as we learn from his tombstone, reverted to *Claudius*. Some words of an archaic cast, or connected with law or ritual, retain *oe*: *foedus*; *Poeni*, the obsolete name for the Carthaginians, but *Punicus*; *poena* (from Greek *ποινή*) but *punio*; *pomoerium* becomes *pomerium*. For the more accurate representation of Greek words *y* and *z* are borrowed and added at the end of the alphabet<sup>1</sup>. *Πύρρος* is no longer Burrus but Pyrrhus. False etymology introduces the spelling of *pulcrum* as *pulchrum*. The heroes of Athens and Sparta appear as *Theseus* and *Lycurgus*, no longer, as on an early mirror from Praeneste, *Taseos* and *Lugorcos*, where, however, the spelling is possibly that of an Etruscan artist.

1216. With the Christian era begins the change to the Silver Age of Latinity. The forerunners of that age are Livy and Propertius. It is possible that, in both, variations from the best Latinity of the previous age may be due to their provincial origin. In all probability Propertius was brought up at Asisium in Umbria; in Livy Asinius Pollio (Quintilian i 5, 56) professed to be able to trace a certain *Patauinitas* from the fact that he was born at Patauium. With Suetonius the Silver Age may be regarded as at an end. The characteristics of the Silver Age are found also in other countries amongst writers whose fortune it is to live in the period succeeding a great literary age when there is a lack of new ideas. The prestige of the older writers prevents the new from attempting to rival them on their own lines; all that is left for them to do is to express the old ideas in a new way. The extreme example of this in the Silver Age is the style of the *Annals* of Tacitus. An exaggerated conciseness and point take the place of the more elaborate periods of the past. The language contains occasional archaic words and phrases derived from poetry<sup>2</sup>. But it is no less a mistake to treat the style of Tacitus as representative of the Silver Age than it would be to treat the style of Carlyle's *Frederick the Great* as typical of the age which produced Macaulay, Ruskin, and Froude. The characteristics of the Silver Age (as said above) are those found in other literatures also, when a period without great movements or new ideas succeeds one of much action or vigorous thought. The Empire gave no scope for independent action, there was no hope for a new author of surpassing his predecessors on their own ground. But, as the Alexandrian age thought

The Silver Age.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. p. 729 f *supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. p. 680 *supra*.

a great book a great evil, so the writers of the Roman Empire developed the short epigrammatic sentence in preference to the slow and rounded period of their predecessors which was now felt to be tedious. Their method was fostered and developed by the rhetorical schools. The most conspicuous characteristic of the age is this rhetorical tendency. It affects all its writers, even those who, like Quintilian, professed to follow the methods of the previous age. Even in the Prooemium of Book vi, a passage instinct with genuine feeling, the expression of Quintilian is rhetorical in the extreme. The other noteworthy characteristics of the age are (a) the increase in the number of Greek words in ordinary use. These often represent new arts or new fashions introduced from Greece or Greek-speaking countries, just as similar causes have repeatedly flooded English with French words. But it must not be forgotten that Roman civilisation was as much Greek as Roman and that the upper classes spoke both languages with equal freedom. The advice of the emperor Claudius to a foreigner was to be equipped with both *our* languages (*cum utroque sermone nostro sit paratus*: Suet. *Claud.* 24, 1). (b) Literary reminiscences. Virgil became to the Romans what Shakespeare and the Authorised Version of the Bible have been to English, and a fillip was given to the style by the use of obsolete words from the poets of the second century B.C. which by the end of the period were at least as strange to the Roman as the phraseology of Chaucer is to the ordinary English reader. Even at its very beginning, the freedman Verrius Flaccus, tutor to the grandsons of Augustus, found it necessary to write a voluminous work on the signification of words. This work is now lost, but an epitome by Festus is in part preserved and a much briefer epitome of Festus by Paulus has survived intact<sup>1</sup>. (c) The literary use of words from the common dialect. A portion of the slang of one age always creeps into the literary language of the next; its presence is always regretted by the older generation. Swift and his contemporaries denounced many words like *mob* and *fuss* which have become part and parcel of the later English tongue. The Romans were no less pessimistic. In the famous epitaph of Naeuius *plenum superbiae Campanae* it was said (about 200 B.C.) that with him had perished the Latin tongue at Rome (*obliti sunt Romai loquii lingua Latina*). But no doubt many of the words were not slang, but (d) simply such as had not yet found their way into literature or into the small part of it which has reached us. Of these words many are compounds especially with *con*, *de* and *in*, which merely emphasize the meaning of the simple word. The beginnings of this go very far back. Plautus has *concastigo*, *consuadeo* and many others, the elder Cato's use of *deambulare* was objected to (Cic. *de Oratore*, ii 256). The same striving after effect is seen in the multiplication of frequentatives or intensive forms; *dico* gives not only *dicto* but also *dictito*, *cano* not only *cantare* but also *cantitare* as early as Terence.

<sup>1</sup> § 1240 *infra*.

**1217.** The characteristics just described are those which had the greatest influence upon the later history of Latin, for it is these that have passed into its modern representatives **the Romance languages**. These did not arise out of the classical Latin of literature, but out of the language of the common folk. Our knowledge of the language of the people can be gathered only indirectly. As we have seen, its characteristics crop up here and there in classical Latin. It appears also on the tombstones of common folk and on inscriptions of other sorts which record their doings. The continuations of Caesar's wars, *bellum Africanum* and *bellum Hispaniense*, were apparently written by soldiers of inferior rank who wrote much as they spoke. In the *Satiricon* of Petronius Arbiter the occasional speakers use the vulgar dialect<sup>1</sup>. It is easy to see why the Romance languages should be founded upon this, rather than upon literary Latin. The spread of Latin followed Roman conquest; the great mass of Romans in the provinces were soldiers and traders. The character of the different Romance languages is different because (a) the native substratum is different, (b) the dates of the Roman conquest of different provinces are separated by wide intervals. Spanish Latin begins about 200 B.C., Roumanian Latin in the time of Trajan. (c) The Latin of the original settlers itself varied; e.g. in Spain there was a very large element of the Italic stock; one of the earliest settlements was Italica. Hence out of Latin develop many languages:—(1) Italian, in some respects from a decadent form of Latin, because the development was unbroken; (2) Sardinian from the Latin of 238 B.C.; (3) Spanish from the Latin of 200 B.C.; (4) Provençal from Latin of 120 B.C.; (5) Northern French from that of the age of Julius Caesar; (6) Rhaetian from the Latin of a generation later; (7) Roumanian from the Latin of 100 A.D. Though differing in character, these languages remain Latin for centuries; documents which can be said to be French are not found earlier than 842 A.D. Through all this period there was a constant production of literature, in the later period Christian only. The writers of the Empire, as of the Republic, were not often Romans born. Many writers of the first century of the Empire—the Senecas, Lucan, Martial, Quintilian—were Spaniards; in the next age the writers, and especially the Christian writers, were Africans<sup>2</sup>. Ausonius, the last writer who can claim to be able to write classical Latin, was a professor at Bordeaux. The Latin that passed muster as literature may be well studied in Gregory of Tours. But this is an investigation which cannot be entered upon here<sup>3</sup>.

#### SPECIMENS OF LATIN INSCRIPTIONS.

[The inscriptions given here all belong to the pre-Christian era. For the inscriptions of the Scipios and the decree of Aemilius Paulus, 189 B.C., see pp. 734-6 and p. 757 respectively.

<sup>1</sup> Cp. middle of p. 673 *supra*.

<sup>2</sup> Cp. pp. 684-688 *supra*.

<sup>3</sup> Cp. § 1247 *infra*.

An excellent short manual of inscriptions from all periods is the *Handbook of Latin Inscriptions illustrating the history of the language* by Prof. W. M. Lindsay (Boston, Allyn and Bacon 1897).]

i. Extract from the 'Sctum de Bacchanalibus', 186 B.C.

Sacra in oquoltod ne quisquam fecise uelet neue in poplicod neue in priuatod neue exstrad urbem sacra quisquam fecise uelet nisei pr. urbanum adieset isque de senatuos sententiad dum ne minus senatoribus C adesent quom ea res cosoleretur iousiset.

The language is more archaic than that of the decree of Aemilius Paulus, which is three years earlier; there no ablative in *-d* appears, while, the *Sct. de B.* has *sententiad*, and other examples, in the above passage. The adverb *exstrad* (extra) was originally an ablative. While the decree has early examples of the doubling of consonants, as in *uellet* and *possidere*, by the side of *posedisent*, the *Sct. de B.* invariably retains the single consonant, as in *adieset*, *adesent* and *iousiset*. *iousiset*, like *iousit* in the decree (a form frequent in old Latin), seems to have the diphthong *ou* of the original pft, while the classical form *iussit* (with *iussisset* etc.) is a new formation on the analogy of the participle *iussus*. *cosoleretur* stands for *consuleretur*, *n* before *s* and *f* being dropped in pronunciation, while the preceding vowel is lengthened.

ii. An inscription containing the names of Gaius Gracchus, Appius Claudius Pulcher and P. Licinius Crassus, the three commissioners *agris iudicandis assignandis*.

C. S[e]mpronius Ti. f. Grac., | Ap. Claudius C. f. Polc., | P. Licinius P. f. Cras. | IIIuir. a. i. a.

iii. Part of an inscription in memory of Aurelia, a freedwoman, the wife of L. Aurelius a freedman who, as is explained elsewhere in the inscription, was a butcher on the Viminal. The forms *ree*, *ee*, *naatam* show the doubling of vowels which survived for long in inscriptions, though here side by side with *me*, *nata* etc.

uiua Philematium sum | Aurelia nominata, |  
casta pudens, uolgei | nescia, feida uiro. |  
uir conleibertus fuit, | eidem, quo careo | eheu, |  
ree fuit ee uero plus | superaue parens. |  
septem me naatam | annorum gremio | ipse recepit,  
XXXX | annos nata necis potior. |

iv. From Capua. In three of the hexameters a final *-s* is elided. *iuenta* for *iuuenta* with the semivowel dropped between two vowels; cp. Latin Gaius with Oscan Gaviis, Latin *duo* with Umbrian *tuva*.

Cn. Taracius Cn. f. | uixit a. XX, ossa eius hic sita sunt. |  
eheu heu Taracei, ut acerbo es deditus fato.  
non aeuo | exsacto uitai ea traditus morti,  
sed cum te decuit florere aetate | iuenta,  
interieisti et liquisti in maeroribus matrem.

**Latin:** Roby, *A grammar of the Latin Language from Plautus to Suetonius*, 2 vols. 5th ed. 1887; Neue, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, 3 vols. 3rd ed.

Bibliography. edited by Wagener, 1897—1902; Draeger, *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*, 2 vols. 2nd ed. 1878—1881; Lindsay, *The Latin Language* (no syntax) 1894, *A short Historical Latin Grammar* 1895; Stolz, Blase, etc.: *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 1894 ff (still unfinished); Stolz and Schmalz, *Lateinische Grammatik* (*Laut- und Formenlehre: Syntax und Stilistik*) 4th ed. 1910; Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* 1902; Riemann et Goelzer, *Grammaire comparée du Grec et du Latin*, vol. ii, *Syntaxe* 1897, vol. i, *Phonétique et étude des formes* 1901.



Summaries of the history of Latin sounds and syntax will be found in Niedermann's *Historische Lautlehre des Lateinischen* 1907 (translated with some additions by E. Hermann from an earlier French edition) and Riemann, *Syntaxe latine* 5th ed. edited by Lejay 1908. The relations of Latin to other languages are treated in Giles, *A short manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students* 2nd ed. 1901; Meillet, *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes* 2nd ed. 1908; Brugmann, *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik* 1902-4, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen* 2nd ed. vol. i, 1897, vol. ii, 3 parts, containing stem formation, and formation and use of Noun cases, 1906-9, 1911; Stolz, *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Göschens series), 1910, is a good popular account.

For the languages of Italy generally: Kretschmer, *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* 1896: articles on the several languages in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie* vol. i. **Messapian**: Droop (*The Messapian Inscriptions in Annual of the British School of Athens for 1905-6*) has sifted out the numerous forged inscriptions. Ribezzo, *La Lingua degli Antichi Messapii* 1907 has discussed the text and meaning of the inscriptions. **Venetic**: Pauli, *Altitalische Forschungen* vol. iii, 1891; a new edition of the inscriptions is being prepared by Prof. R. Seymour Conway. **Ligurian**: Pauli, *Altitalische Forschungen* vol. i, p. 56 f, 70-8; Kretschmer, *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* 38, p. 97 ff; Hirt, *Die Indogermanen* i, 43, ii, 563. **Gaulish**: Stokes, *Trans. Philol. Society* 1885; Rhys, *Celtic inscriptions of Gaul and Italy* (*Proceedings of the British Academy* 1906). **Greek**: Buck, *The Greek Dialects* 1910, Thumb, *Handbuch der griech. Dialekte* 1909. Borrowed words: O. Weise, *Die griechischen Wörter im Latein* 1882. **Etruscan**: The inscriptions are collected in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Etruscarum* in course of publication, the book appeared in the *Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie* 1892. The best treatment of the language is by Skutsch in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-encyclopaedie* s.v. *Etruskische Sprache*. **Lydian**: Keil and von Premerstein with Kretschmer's notes in *Denkschriften der Wiener Akademie* 1908; a complete inscription, with the words divided, has been found in the American excavations of Sardis. **Italic dialects**: Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, 2 vols. 1897; von Planta, *Die italischen Dialekte* 2 vols. 1893-7; Buck, *Handbook of the Italic Dialects* 1905. **Dialectic Latin**: Ernout, *Le parler de Praeneste* 1907, *Les éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin* 1909; Grandgent, *An introduction to vulgar Latin* 1908. Many of these books contain extensive bibliographies; for syntax, see especially the list of works on the individual authors compiled by Schmalz in the *Lateinische Grammatik*, for Plautus, Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus* (St Andrews University Publications iv) 1907; Bennett, *Syntax of early Latin* (to 100 B.C.) vol. i, the verb, 1910. **Silver Age Latin**: Summers, *Select Letters of Seneca* (Introduction) 1910; M. D. Brock, *Studies in Fronto and his age*, 1911, appendix pp. 161-261. A popular account of some interesting features of Latin will be found in O. Weise's *Language and Character of the Roman People*, translated by Strong and A. Y. Campbell, 1909. Excellent accounts of Latin for the general reader are given by Skutsch in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart* 18 (1905) p. 412 ff and by Kretschmer in *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* i (1910) p. 172 ff.

**Latin Inscriptions**: For manuals of selections, cp. p. 764 *supra*.

## X. 2. METRE.

1218. THE classical poetry of the Romans took its metres from Greek.

The native verse called *Saturnian*, which existed before the importation of Greek culture, was so rough as to be sometimes hardly distinguishable from prose. A favourable specimen is the epitaph ascribed to Naeuius, the chief of those who attempted to use the metre in literature:—

*immortāles mortāles | sī forēt fas flēre,*  
*flērent diuāe Camēnae | Naeuiām poētām; etc.<sup>1</sup>*

The verse here has two parts, with three main ‘beats’ or stresses in each part; and the sonority is helped out, as in the oldest English verse, by *alliteration*, or repetition of letters. The verse has little or no literary importance, but its general character must be grasped, in order to understand what happened, when the choice was made for adopting the system of the Greeks.

1219. What this was, we may explain by contrasting the method of

English. The syllables of *broad-sword*, in common pronunciation, fill, we may say, equal lengths of time. A similar Greek word, say *πλῶντοῦ*, was limited in metrical use by the equal length of its syllables. Not so *broad-sword*. A beat, accent, stress on the first syllable makes us feel little objection to a verse like this:—

*And | sáve his good | bróad-sword he | weápons had | nóne,*

where *broad-sword he* makes a rhythm something like *πῆματᾶ* or *cōrporᾶ*, a long syllable followed by two short. English verse then is, in the main, not quantitative, but accentual. So to some extent, as we have seen, was Italian verse, which, left to itself, would have kept this principle, as it has long ago returned to it. But the Italian ear for quantity was (and is) much more delicate than ours; and the Latin poets, using Greek literary models, were led to develop the quantitative element in their language, and make their metre as like Greek as they could. The choice was determined by the success of Ennius (§ 903), about 200 B.C. But the new art, though it expelled the old, itself made little progress for more than a century. For the popular purposes of the theatre, a sort of compromise was made between the native way and the foreign. Learned poetry followed Greek metre, but haltingly, till a stimulus was given by the powerful works of Lucretius, Catullus, and others. Then, within a generation, the process was carried by the Augustan poets, Varius, Virgil, Horace, Tibullus, Propertius, Ovid, and their contemporaries, as far as was practicable,—we may almost say

<sup>1</sup> Gellius, i 24, 2 (Hertz). There are textual variations in line 1. See also the Scipio epitaphs on pp. 734-6 *supra*.

farther; and forms were fixed, which served till the dissolution of the Empire.

**1220.** We have first to consider the theatrical compromise, now represented chiefly by Plautus and Terence. The ordinary metres of Greek Comedy were *Trochaic* and *Iambic*, divisible into parts (*feet*) of which each consists of a long syllable followed by a short (— ∪ is a *trochee*), or of equivalents, more or less exact, for these quantities. If the metre begins with a complete foot, as:—

Metre in  
Drama.  
Plautus.

1st foot	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th
— ∪	— ∪	— ∪	— —	∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪ —	— ∪	—
impe-	trabis,	impe-	rator,	quod ego	potero,	quod uo-	les

it is *trochaic*; if it starts with a preliminary half-foot, as:—

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
∪	— ∪	— ∪	— ∪	— ∪	— ∪	—
a-	pris re-	liquit	et ra-	paci-	bus lup-	is

it is called, not very correctly, *iambic* (∪ — is an *iambus*). Either sort of metre may end either with a complete trochee (— ∪) or, as in the two quotations, with an incomplete foot (—). Both sorts produced various metres, differing in the number of the feet. The metre of the second quotation (called *iambic senarius* because it can be divided into six *iambi*) has in the strictest form the quantities above marked. Even in Greek, however, it admitted many freedoms, and most in comedy. But in all Greek forms it retains, in the whole movement, the principle of quantity: not only is the penultimate syllable (*lup-*) necessarily short, but the 1st foot, and also the 3rd, must end with a short vowel; you could not put, in either of these places, the quantities — — or ∪ ∪ —. But consider now this iambic senarius of Plautus:—

	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
—	— —	— —	— —	— —	— ∪	—
quam	magno	uento	plenumst	unda-	rum ma-	re <sup>1</sup> .

The penultimate syllable here is short (as always in Plautus), but in the rest of the verse all trace of quantitative trochees has disappeared. In *magno*, *uento*, *plenumst*, *unda-*, there is no difference of quantity whatever between the parts of the foot. Why then should the verse be regarded as trochaic at all? Only because of the beat of the rhythm, coinciding with the natural accent of the words, on the first syllables in *mágnō*, *uênto* and *plénūmst*. This, for Plautus, as for English composers, made sufficient difference between these syllables and those not so weighted or accented. The foot *undá-*, though not a trochee either by quantity or by the accent of the word, is admitted (as in our poetry often) for the sake of variety.

<sup>1</sup> The final syllable, though short, counts as long by the effect of the pause at the end of the verse, as it might also in Greek.

The metre, thus written, is a compromise between the principle of quantity (5th foot) and the principles of verse-beat and natural accent.

These latter principles were carried far. Such words as *sēdētārūm*, such phrases as *ēnīm uēro*, were allowed to scan, by beat or accent, as *sēdētārūm*, *ēnīm uēro*. For the details, and for the many peculiarities of the old pronunciation (*eo*, *meo*, and even *huius* can all be long monosyllables), the student should refer to good editions of the poets, e.g. the *Miles Gloriosus* of Plautus, as edited by Professor Tyrrell. The point to note here is that the adoption of Greek principles was half-hearted and very imperfect. They were too foreign for the general public.

**1221.** Terence is later than Plautus and more learned. Examine the

Terence. prologue to the *Andria*, which, being a defence of the poet,

may be taken for a careful composition. He has learned from the Greeks, for instance, that iambic senarii should vary in the division of the words between the feet, sometimes after the second foot, so:—*īd | sībī nēg-|ōtī | crēdī-|dīt sō |lūm dā-|rī*, and sometimes after the third foot, so:—*uēr(um)¹ | āūtēr | ēuē-|nūrē || mūlt(o) īn-|tēllē-gīt*; Plautus attends little to this. Terence has also perceived that a large use of accent as a substitute for length is scarcely consistent with the use of *dāri* for the final iambus of such a verse; such disyllabic endings are much less numerous than in Plautus. Moreover, verses like these two, which keep the Greek rules of the metre, are more numerous. But in general the compromise of principles is maintained, as it was also to some extent in tragedy; and in respect merely of metre, the dialogue of the old dramatists has not much merit or interest.

**1222.** Much more remarkable are the Plautine *Songs*, so important for

Plautine  
Songs.

our purpose that we must quote one entire. A lover expostulates with the bolts (*pessuli*) of his lady's door (*Curculio*, Act I, Sc. 2):—

*pēssul(i)¹, heūs, | pēssulī, | uōs salū-|tō lubēns,  
uōs amō, uōs uolō, uōs pet(o) atqu(e) ōbsecrō,  
gērīt(e) amāntī mihī mōr(em), amōenīssimī:  
f'ite causā meā lūdiū bārbarī²,  
sūssulīt(e), ōbsecr(o), ēt mīttīt(e) īstānc forās,  
quāē mihī | mīsr(o) amānt(i) | ēxhibīt sāguīnēm.—  
hōc uid(e), ūt dōrmiūnt pēssulī pēssimī,  
nēc meā grātiā cōmmouēt s(e) ōciūs.*

These songs (in various accentual metres) are essentially a native production. Though commonly called by Greek names (*bacchiac*, from the foot *baccheios* — —, *cretic*, from the foot — —, etc.), they have no real resemblance to Greek composition; and the metre (see *Captiui*, i 1, 65 f)

¹ The parts so enclosed are *elided*, and do not count for the metre.

² 'Leap (out of your sockets) like Italian dancers'. Note this significant expression.



is often very loose in respect of quantity. But, though unpolished, they have a natural air, which hardly anyone, except Catullus, could give to Latin poetry dominated by the Greek system.

1223. We must observe also carefully that Plautine verse is loaded with alliteration,

*curat(e) ut splendor mēo sit clupeo clarior  
quam solis radi(i) esse olim, quom sudumst, solent,*

and so on,—alliteration used not for special effects, but as a regular and necessary element of poetry; compare the song above cited. Nothing could be more Latin, or less Greek. Terence reduces this element greatly, and shows the inevitable loss of power. A similar struggle is traceable throughout the history of classical Latin; compare Virgil with Horace.

1224. Such then were the conditions, under which the importers of the Greek system had to work. Their difficulties were great, and their success limited, though within certain limits triumphant. The first and most successful importation was the *Dactylic Hexameter*, which, established by Ennius, attained perfection in Virgil, and its normal type in Ovid. It is composed of feet each *equal to* four short syllables, a long syllable counting as two shorts; — ∪ ∪ is a *dactyl*, — — a *spondee*. The hexameter

Dactylic  
Hexameter.

— ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — —

contains six feet. The first four may be either dactyl or spondee, the fifth is *regularly* a dactyl, and the sixth *always* a spondee. The balance and swing of the verse depends (read carefully a passage of Homer) on a *division within the third foot*, marked almost always by the space *between two words*; the division, called *caesura*<sup>1</sup>, can be made either after the first syllable of the foot (*strong caesura*), thus: *fronte sub aduersā* || *scōpūlis pendentibus antrum* (1), or, provided that the foot is a dactyl, after the second syllable (*weak caesura*), thus: *detulit ex Helicōnē* || *pērenni fronde coronam* (2). In Greek, both divisions were used freely, so as to vary the balance of the verse. But the Latin poets tended from the beginning to regard Division 2 as unsatisfactory. They used it indeed, but almost always in combination with a strong caesura in the *fourth* foot, and generally with a strong caesura in the *second* foot also, as in *id metuens* || *ueterisque* || *memor* || *Saturnia belli*; this combination, which we will call *the triple caesura*, thus became in Latin an extremely important form. Verses *not* having a division between words within the third foot were admitted in Greek, as rare exceptions, provided that they had a strong caesura in the fourth foot, thus:—*despiciens mare*

<sup>1</sup> In the use of the term *caesura* (ροπή) neither ancient nor modern writers on metre are perfectly consistent. It is applied often to division of the verse *by the sense*. But some distinctive term is necessary for a *division between words (within a foot) which is required normally by rule of the metre*; and for this there is no other term available and convenient.

*ueliuolum* || *terrasque iacentes* (3). The Romans somewhat multiplied such exceptions; but, since the undivided third foot is not satisfactory, they generally required, in finished composition, that, even in this case, the third foot should comprise *two parts of a compound word* (*ueli-uolum*, or *in-cepto*, or *in-cedo*, or the like: see *Aeneid* i 37 and 46), a species of division important to the Latin ear. Indivisible proper names, especially Greek (*Aeneas*), are frequently so placed, but indivisible Latin words (such as *irarum* in *Aeneid* i 25) seldom. These rules were established, or nearly established, before the hexameter was taken up by Virgil.

1225. Now they are open to a grave objection. The *triple caesura* is a form too complicated and cramping for constant use; 16 such verses in 100 (Lucan, i 1—100) is a fair proportion; Division 3 is, at best, not very effective and should be exceptional; consequently, Latin hexameters, under these rules, tended necessarily to a monotonous repetition of Division 1, the effect of which is to destroy the unity of the hexameter, and make each verse into two verses, divided by the *caesura*. See for example Catullus lxiv. It became important therefore to vary as much as possible the rhythm of the verses having Division 1. The following devices are employed, among others, for this purpose in *Aeneid*, i 1—100:—

(i) dividing *the sense* in the fourth foot (note the comma), so that the voice is carried lightly over Division 1, as in *multa quoqu(e) et bello | passus, dum conderet urbem*; vv. 5, 6, 8 etc.

(ii) making Division 1 after a conjunction or the like, so that again the voice runs over it lightly, as in *imperio premit ac | uindictis et carcere frenat*; vv. 3, 19, 28, 54 etc.

(iii) bridging Division 1 by an elision, as in *sceptra tenens mollitqu(e) | animos et temperat iras*; vv. 11, 57, 61, 98.

(iv) breaking the sense just *before* Division 1, which may be done either (note the semicolon) as in *hic currus fuit; hoc | regnum dea gentibus esse...* (vv. 17, 52, 82, 96), or else

(v) as (note the comma) in *qua data porta, ruunt | et terras turbine perfant* (vv. 81, 83).

Such is the care and such the fertility of Virgil.

As a result of all this, verses exhibiting the strong *caesura* (Division 1) without any compensatory and qualifying variety (such as vv. 1, 7, 15, 18, 24), become themselves merely occasional variations, and the danger of the metrical rule is completely averted.

1226. But a rhythm so various, since every variation must of course be adapted to the sense, is extremely difficult; and no one, except Virgil, ever came near to it. For example, in Ovid *Metamorphoses*, i 1—100, the important variations numbered ii, iii, iv, and v do not appear at all<sup>1</sup>. Nor does Division 3. The only forms used are Division 1 (simple), Division 1 (with variation i), and the *triple caesura*. Modifications of this last (e.g.

<sup>1</sup> *Met.* i 77 and 78 might perhaps be reckoned under variation ii, but are much less effective than those cited from Virgil.

*Aen.* i 85), which Ovid neglects or avoids, are by Virgil sought and adapted to special effects. So also a break of sense after the first syllable of the second foot (*Aen.* i 11) is about twice as frequent in the passage of Virgil as in that of Ovid. And similarly all subsequent composers make selections, different in quality (but about equal in amount), from the variety of Virgil. Some of them, however, especially Ovid, Lucan, and Juvenal, use the reduced compass with extraordinary power.

1227. Upon the end of the hexameter, as well as on the *caesura*, the Augustans imposed restrictions unknown to the Greeks, requiring generally either this division of words: *primus* | *ab oris*, or this: *moenia* | *Romae*, and thus excluding many fine effects, such as,

*quem neque fama deum, nec fulmina, nec* | *minitanti*  
*murmure compressit caelum* (Lucretius).

Greek words, however, retain their freedom (*Aen.* i 72), and, in special circumstances, even Latin: see the religious formula *diuom pater atqu(e)* | *hominum rex* (*Aen.* i 65). Lucretius in many respects uses a liberty, which was in his time already old-fashioned. For instance, to make the first two feet consist of a single word, as in *Lucr.* i 113 *relligionibus* | *atque minis obsistere uatum*, would have been generally disapproved both by Greeks and Augustans. The causes of the Latin restrictions are subtle, and, in part, not clearly ascertained, though doubtless they depend upon accent, that is to say, the natural pitch and stress of syllables in the words. We must be content here to indicate the main facts.

The rules of *elision* in Latin, very different from those in Greek, belong rather to prosody than metre. Virgil uses it freely for variety; but his method requires great subtlety of observation. The smoothness of Ovid, who seldom admits any elision but the lightest (after *que*, before *et*, before *est*, etc.), is perhaps safer, and tended to prevail.

1228. The *Elegiac Couplet* is composed of a hexameter followed by a (so-called) *pentameter*, really a hexameter in which the third foot and the sixth lack each the latter half, represented not by a syllable but by a pause, thus:

*donec e-|ris fe-|lix mul-|tos numer-|abis am-|icos;*  
*tempora* | *si fue-|rint* (pause) | *nubila,* | *solus e-|ris* (pause).





Elegiac  
Couplet.

In the second section of the pentameter, both the first foot (*nubila*) and the second (*solus e-*) must be dactyls, and, to secure smoothness, elision is generally excluded from this part of the verse, which is also severely regulated in regard to the division of words. In Greek, and in Latin before the Augustan age (see Catullus *ci*, and elsewhere), such divisions as *adloquerer* | *cinerem* or *frater ad* | *inferias* were permitted or preferred. But the practice of Tibullus, of Propertius (except in his earliest book), and of Ovid, established the general rule that the pentameter must end with a disyllable, as *causa timoris erat*, or a word of five syllables, as *triste super-*

*calium*<sup>1</sup>; Greek words only retain their freedom, as in *candida Cymothoe*. Under these conditions, not even Ovid could avoid monotony; but, in short and highly finished pieces, the metre is very effective. In the epigrams of Martial, the Ovidian rule is frequently broken *in the last verse only*, to bring out the point: see *Ep.* i 16, 12: *sera nimis uit(a) est crastina: uiu(e) | hodie*.

1229. The hexameter in satire has a distinct history. The declared purpose of Horace in his *Sermones* ('Talks') was to adapt to his age the loose and garrulous composition of Lucilius (2nd century B.C.: see on *Literature*, § 913, and *Hor. Sat.* i 10, 46 etc.). The metre therefore is a compromise, exquisitely skilful, between the antique method and the Augustan. His *Epistles* are smoother, but retain much careful negligence. Note in *Epistle* i 9 the *one* irregular caesura (*v.* 4 *dignum mente domoque legentis honesta Neronis*) and the *one* irregular stop (*v.* 11 *frontis ad urbanae descendi praemia. quod si...*). Even a century later, the Horatian method is used, but much less skilfully, by Persius. Juvenal, with his severe tone and rhetorical manner, naturally does not follow these precedents, and his metre differs little from the average type.

1230. These, the Hexameter and Elegiac, were the most important and completely successful of the importations from Greek, partly and chiefly because of their metrical simplicity, because they require only two quantities, 'longs' and 'shorts'. But there are of course many musical measures, which cannot be so expressed. The Greek lyrics (songs etc.) were largely composed in such measures; and, when the Romans attempted these, new difficulties arose, which we must now explain.

Let these signs, , , , and , stand for four sounds having lengths in the proportion 2, 1½, 1, and ½. Then the following four combinations, or feet,



will be each equal to 3. And all the four feet together will make a measure of four feet in 3-time, that is so say, divisible into parts or feet, of which each is equal to 3. And any number of feet, each equal to 3, in any order, will make a measure in 3-time. Thus the words



will make a measure of four feet in 3-time, *provided that we give to each syllable the length of the note or notes written under it*, prolonging, for


<sup>1</sup> Other endings are found (*inuia fluminibus*, *Ov. Fast.* v 582), but very rarely.



example, the last syllable, *-ae*, so as to be equal to thrice the syllable *-ni-*, which, *in singing*, it is easy to do. So also



will be a measure of six feet, if we make *-o-* and *-tur* each equal to 3. And these lines,



will be each a measure of eight feet, if we sing the syllables accordingly, *certe* as  $1\frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{1}{2}$ , *tute iu-* as  $1\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + 1$ , *-be-* as 3, and so on. But,—here is the point which must be clearly understood, in order to appreciate the Roman difficulties, and the solution adopted,—such a treatment of words is natural *only in singing*. Of course no one, in speaking, pronounced the word *iubebas* so that the second syllable was thrice as long as the first. Nor did the Greeks so pronounce such a word as  $\phi\upsilon\tau\epsilon\acute{o}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ . But they could *sing* it so; and their lyric metres were composed strictly for singing. Now the Romans wrote not for music, but for recitation, as we do. And therefore, when they attempted verses of this sort (called *Asclepiads*), the question arose, how they should treat words like *iubebas*. They tried the Greek way: the verses *certe tute* etc. are by Catullus (xxx). But it is not surprising that they were dissatisfied. Unlearned readers would scarcely see how such verses were to be read; and even learned readers would feel the required pronunciation to be forced and odd. Accordingly Horace, who wrote largely in such metres, adopted the rule (almost invariable) that, *wherever the metre required a syllable equal to 3, that syllable must be the last of a word*, as in '*si non supplicio culpa reciditur*'. Even the penultimate syllable of an elided word (*Acheront(a)* in Hor. *Ode i 3, 36*) is hardly ever allowed in such places, but only a final syllable. This rule diminished the difficulty of catching the measure in recitation, because the natural pause after the word *supplicio* could be made equal in time to  $1\frac{1}{2}$ , and so the syllable *-o*, in order to make up the foot, is prolonged only to  $1\frac{1}{2}$ , which is much less unnatural than 3. But,—this again must be carefully noted,—the rule made such verses extremely artificial and embarrassing to the composer. Very few forms of word are admissible; crowds of common and important words are excluded; and the Latin vocabulary would ill bear the restriction. Moreover the metre, so bound, is necessarily somewhat monotonous. Further, for reasons subtle, though doubtless sufficient, it was decided that, in Latin, *the first foot of an Asclepiad verse must consist of two 'long' syllables* ( $1\frac{1}{2} + 1\frac{1}{2}$ ), and not of  $- \cup (2 + 1)$ , a restriction not natural to the metre and

increasing the stiffness.—For the different types of Asclepiad verses, and forms of stanza, see Horace *Odes* i 1, 3, 5 and 11. In *Ode* 5, the third line of the stanza has the form *grato Pyrrha sub antro*, which a Greek would probably have sung as four feet (not three), making *each* syllable of *án-tró* equal to a foot. Whether Horace intended this is doubtful, as he never writes two monosyllables (such as *non te*) in this place. But both syllables are always long.

1231. Yet other embarrassments were felt in adapting the *Sapphic* and *Alcaic* metres. These also are 3-time measures; each foot is equal to 3 units of length. The common Sapphic verse consisted in Greek of five feet, thus:—

Sapphic  
Metre.



having alternatives in the second and fifth foot. The common Sapphic stanza (Hor. *Odes* i 2, i 12, etc.) consisted of three such verses, followed by a verse of two feet, — ∪ ∪ | — ∪. In Greek, the words might be divided at pleasure between the feet, and even between verses. With these liberties, and with the Greek vocabulary, the measure, which is very beautiful, could be written quite naturally. Catullus (see Poems xi and li) did not definitely adopt any restriction. But Horace almost abandoned the junction of verses, and bound the five-foot verse by very severe rules. *Firstly*, there must be a division between words either after the fifth syllable as in *integer uitae | scelerisque purus*, or after the sixth syllable, as in *laurea donandus | Apollinari*; so that such a verse as *παῖ Διός, δῶλόπλοκῆ, λίσσομαι σε* (Sappho) was forbidden. In his original collection of poems (Books i—iii) Horace goes further still, giving almost invariably the division after the fifth syllable. *Secondly*, the first two feet must not consist of a single word, or a group of words closely joined by the sense; so that *ποικιλόθρον' | ἄθάναρ' Ἀφροδίτα* (Sappho) is avoided, and even *Gallicum Rhen(um) | horrible aequor<sup>1</sup> ulti-mosque Britannos* (Catullus). Indeed a division after the fourth syllable under any conditions (e.g. *Odes* i 2, 17; i 12, 14) is rare. *Thirdly*, the second foot together with the trochaic part (— ∪) of the third must not make up a single word<sup>2</sup>, but must be divided or divisible, as in *et lasciva* or *siluarum-que*. *Fourthly*, the second foot is always — — (not — ∪). Thus *pauca nuntiate meae puellae* (Catullus) becomes doubly illegitimate, by Rules 3 and 4. Even these four rules do not exhaust the observances of Horace, but they will suffice to show his manner.—The metre of *Ode* i 8 is a different construction of the same elements.

<sup>1</sup> Haupt's emendation.

<sup>2</sup> As in *fata donauere bonique diui* (*Od.* iv 2, 38); such an exception has probably some special purpose.

1232. The Alcaic stanza (Horace *Odes*, i 9 etc.) is closely allied to the Sapphic, but began with a half-foot (*anacrusis*). The quantities in Greek were these:—

Alcaic Metre.

$\bar{\cup} | - \cup | - \bar{\cup} | - \cup \cup | - \cup | -$   
 $\bar{\cup} | - \cup | - \bar{\cup} | - \cup \cup | - \cup | -$   
 $\bar{\cup} | - \cup | - \bar{\cup} | - \cup | - \bar{\cup} || - \cup \cup | - \cup \cup | - \cup | - \bar{\cup}$

The last line is generally written in two verses (divided at ||), but this, and the whole stanza, is in strict metre continuous. The alternatives of quantity here exhibited, and other freedoms similar to those of the Sapphic, are necessary to natural composition. Horace (1) made the preliminary half-foot, in lines 1, 2, and 3, regularly long<sup>1</sup>; (2) made the second foot in each line always -- (not -  $\cup$ ), thus: *frustra cruēntō Marte carebimus*, and *nec carus aequē nec superstes*; (3) divided the first line, and also the second, almost invariably after the fifth syllable, as in *frustra cruento | Marte*; (4) divided the third line, by preference, so that the three long syllables, 4th, 5th, and 6th, should be included within a single word, as in *ornare pulvinar deorum*, or in *ludo fatigatumque somno*, or within a closely connected group, as in *appone, nec dulces amores*, rather than as in *nec carus aequē nec superstes*; and further regulated the metre in many ways, which cannot here be stated in detail. For these we must refer to commentaries on the *Odes*.

Now it must be distinctly understood, that these restrictions are contrary to the nature and spirit of the metres; and some of them (notably the lengthening of the half-foot in the Alcaic) are difficult to explain, though the motives are doubtless connected with the natural accentuation of words, important in Latin metre but not in Greek. The total effect of them is to make the metres extremely difficult, and quite unfit for the free expression of thought or feeling. The literary skill which enabled Horace, under such conditions, to make one of the most famous books of poetry in the world, is astounding; but, for our present purpose, it is more important to note that his achievement was unique. In lyrics, he seems to have had no imitator or successor of conspicuous merit.

The metrical principles of Roman lyrics will appear sufficiently from what has been said. For the various forms, too numerous for description, we must refer to Catullus, Horace, and commentaries upon them. We will notice here only such elements as are not easily explained by reference to the metres above discussed.


1233. *Iambic* measures (see above on the metre of Plautus) were largely used in lyrics, but were written on quantitative principles, in forms, of more or less strictness, copied accurately from the Greek, and not with the inconsistent freedoms of the stage. Reter to Catullus iv, and the *Epodes* of Horace generally. In *Epodes* 13, 15, 16, and elsewhere, iambic measures are combined or alternated with

Lyrical  
Iambics, etc.

<sup>1</sup> *Ode* i 9, 1 is one of the rare exceptions.

dactylic (hexameters or parts of hexameters). *Trochaic* measures are less used in lyric; but see Horace *Ode* ii 18, vv. 1, 3, 5, etc. In the fine metre of Horace *Ode* i 4,

— ◡ ◡ | — ◡ ◡ | — — | — ◡ ◡ | — ◡ | — ◡ | — —  
soluitur | acris hi- | ems gra- | ta uice | ueris | et Fa- | uoni  
◡ | — ◡ | — — | — ◡ | — ◡ | — —  
tra- | hunt que | siccas | machi- | nae ca- | rinas

and so on alternately, the first verse has four dactylic feet followed by three trochees (or *four* trochees, if each of the last two syllables be prolonged to the length of a foot, thus | *uo-ni*; see above on Asclepiads). Such a combination of dactylic measure and trochaic may be read (or sung) either in 3-time or 4-time, but one time must be carried throughout. The second verse is iambic. In 4-time the couplet will run thus (each foot being equal to )




and in 3-time thus (writing  for 1,  for the half of , and  for 1½)



In *Epode* 16,

*altera iam teritur bellis ciuilibus aetas,  
suis et ipsa Roma uiribus ruit*

and so on alternately, the second verse of the couplet is always ‘pure’ iambic, that is to say, the quantities ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — ◡ — admit no choice except in the final syllable. The preservation of this difficult form through 33 couplets, useless if the iambs are to be read like those of *Ode* i 4 (above), suggests that the measure intended (a very fine one) is this (3-time, each foot = ):—



The *Glyconic* metre of Catullus lxi, *Cōllis* | *Ō Hēli-|cōnē-|i* | etc., composed of dactyls and trochees, is closely akin to the Sapphic and the Asclepiad.

1234. A word must be said on *Ionic* metre, for the sake of one poem

Ionic Metre.  
Galliambic.

by Catullus. It is a slow 6-time measure, each foot being equal to 6 ‘shorts’ and consisting normally of — — ◡ ◡ (2 + 2



+ 1 + 1 = 6). Sometimes it starts with an *anacrusis* ( $\frac{1}{2}$  of foot, - or ∪ ∪) thus:—

— ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | and so on.

It is then called *Ionic a minore*, the metre of Horace *Ode* iii 12. Some forms of the measure admit other equal feet, particularly ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ (2 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 6), and ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ (2 + 1 + 2 + 1 = 6), which we may express imperfectly by ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪. In one such form, called *Galliambic*, is written the '*Attis*' of Catullus (lxiii). The verse consists of an *anacrusis*, three feet, and an unfinished foot (monosyllable), thus:—

super	alta uectus	Attis cele-	ri rate mari-	a
∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	— — ∪ ∪	— ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪
∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪

A few variations occur, for instance in the first (complete) foot of *v.* 4:—

stimu-	latus ibi fur-	enti rabi-	e uagus ani-	mi
∪ ∪	— ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	— — ∪ ∪	— ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	—
∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪

and in the *anacrusis*, second foot, and third foot, of *v.* 73:—

iam	iam dolet quod	egi iam	iam que paeni-	tet
—	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	— — —	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	—
∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪ ∪ ∪	∪

In such a foot as *-latus ibi fur-*, a reciter would have the choice between three beats (*-lā-tūs i-bi fur-*) and two beats (*-lātus ibi fur-*); and in some places the latter mode, with two beats, is necessary, or plainly intended, *e.g.* *v.* 91:—

dea | mágna, déa Cy|bebe, dea | dómina Díndy|mi.

For music it is a beautiful rhythm, but it is difficult for recitation, and could not become popular in Latin.

1235. More natural, and more popular than any except hexameters and elegiacs, were the *Hendecasyllable* and the *Seazon*. The *hendecasyllable* verse, as originally framed in Greek, was a 3-time measure of five feet, closely resembling the Sapphic verse (— ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪ ∪ | — ∪ | — ∪), but differing from it in the position of the dactyl, and in certain freedoms of the first foot, thus:—


— ∪	— ∪ ∪	— ∪	— ∪	— ∪
— —	— ∪ ∪	— ∪	— ∪	— ∪
∪ —	∪ ∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪	∪ ∪
ὥσπερ	Ἀρμόδι-	ος κα-	ρίστο-	γείτων

Catullus sometimes wrote it so (i, xxxviii), but usually (*v.* xiv, etc.) under

a rule requiring always these quantities: — — — ∪ ∪ — ∪ ∪ — ∪. These restrictions, purposeless with the original scansion, point to a totally different division into four feet of 4-time (♩ ♩ ♩ ♩) thus:—




And so does the odd experiment of Catullus (iv) 1—



This last did not prevail, but the restrictions did; and the hendecasyllable in this form, very suitable for light verse, is one of the chief metres of Martial (iv 64, x 47, etc.).

So is the *Scæzon* (or *Chôliambic*), also naturalised by Catullus (viii, xxii, xxxi, etc.). It is a perverted sort of iambic verse, scanned thus:—



The reversal of the beat at the end makes the verse *hobbling* (σκάζων), whence the name. It is convenient only for light work (Martial, i 67, iii 58 etc.), but in Catullus (viii) approaches pathos, and in Martial is once at least magnificent (ix 2).

**1236.** The *Choric* metres of the Greeks, with their elaborate musical periods (*strophæ*), were never successfully transplanted into Latin, and indeed cannot well be separated from music, even in idea, without falling into confusion. What Horace says about imitating Pindar, that his verse is independent of law<sup>1</sup>, is in this sense true, and perhaps was so meant. Nor are *anapaests*,—verses in 4-time admitting the foot ∪ ∪ —, with the beat on the first short,—suitable for verse conceived as separable from music. The best attempts in Latin are the oldest, written before Latin had become ashamed of its proper compensations, such as

*Priamo ui uit(am) euitari* (Ennius).

With this homage to the author of the whole movement we may fitly close this brief review.

The metres used in the classical poetry of the Romans are historically reviewed in Lucian Müller's work *De Re Metrica poetarum Latinorum præter Plautum et Terentium*, ed. 2, 651 pp., 1894. A very brief *Summarium* of the first edition was published in 1878, 82 pp.; E. T. by Platner, 1892.

<sup>1</sup> *Ode iv 2, 11, numeris lege solutis.*

## X. 3. HISTORY OF LATIN SCHOLARSHIP.

1237. THE history of Latin Scholarship falls into four periods, (1) the *Roman*, extending from the death of Ennius (169 B.C.) to the publication of Justinian's Code (529 A.D.); (2) the *Mediaeval*, from 529 to the death of Dante in 1321; (3) the *Revival of Learning in Italy*, from about 1321 to the Sack of Rome in 1527; (4) the *Modern* period, including the subsequent history of scholarship in Italy, and in France, the Netherlands, England, and Germany, down to the present day.

Division of  
periods.

## THE ROMAN AGE, 169 B.C. TO 529 A.D.

1238. The Schools of Alexandria and Pergamum, the Grammar of the Stoics, and the controversy between the adherents of Analogy or strict rule (such as Aristophanes of Byzantium, and Aristarchus) and those of Anomaly or popular usage (such as Chrysippus and Crates), had a direct influence on grammatical and literary studies in Rome. The representatives of those studies were either actually Greeks or Romans who had received a Greek education.

Roman period,  
Greek in-  
fluence.

1239. An interest in the study of literature was aroused in Rome by a follower of the Stoic philosophy, Crates of Mallos, who reached Rome from Pergamum 'sub ipsam Ennii mortem' (169 B.C.), and gave recitations and lectures on literary subjects. The example set by Crates prompted the publication of a new edition of Naevius' *First Punic War*, and the recitation of the *Annals* of Ennius and (in the next generation) the *Satires* of Lucilius (Suetonius, *De Grammaticis*, c. 2). A history of Greek and Roman poetry, especially that of the drama, was written by the tragic poet L. Accius (170—c. 86 B.C.), who was the first to discuss the authorship of certain plays ascribed to Plautus. The foremost scholar of the next generation was L. Aelius Stilo (c. 154—c. 74 B.C.), a teacher of Grammar and Rhetoric, who read the plays of Plautus with younger men such as Varro and Cicero. Of the 130 plays bearing the name of Plautus, he recognised 25 as genuine. He also commented on the *Carmina Saliorum*, and wrote on Analogy and Anomaly, and on Syntax. His grammatical and etymological inquiries were partly inspired by his devotion to the Stoic philosophy. In 100 B.C. he left Rome for Rhodes, where he spent two years, and it was probably owing to the influence of the Alexandrian grammarian, Dionysius Thrax, who was then living in Rhodes, that the symbols used by Aristarchus were introduced by Stilo into the criticism of the Latin poets. Much of his lore passed into the pages of Varro and of Verrius Flaccus, of Pliny the Elder,

Crates of  
Mallos.

L. Accius.

L. Aelius  
Stilo.

and of Gellius. Stilo's most famous pupil, Varro (116—27 B.C.) is connected with the history of scholarship by his lost writings on poetry and style, on the drama and on Plautus, and by his treatise *De lingua Latina* (§ 963 *supra*). In the controversy on Analogy and Anomaly Varro inclines to the side of Analogy. The latter was the theme of a special *treatise* by Caesar (§ 974).

1240. Among the Greek authorities followed by Varro was a pupil of Dionysius Thrax, named Tyrannion, the learned adviser of Atticus in his editions of Greek authors. He supposed that Latin was derived from Greek, and in particular from the Aeolic dialect. His contemporary, a pupil of Crates named Alexander Polyhistor, fostered a belief in the imaginary connexion between the kings of Rome and the heroes of Troy, and his legendary history of Rome was followed in certain points by Livy and Virgil. In the same age, L. Ateius Praetextatus, a native of Athens and a freedman of Rome, a student of style and of Roman history, assumed on the ground of his varied learning the name of Philologus. Orthography, synonyms, and etymology were among the favourite studies of Nigidius Figulus (c. 45 B.C.), who was ranked second to Varro in learning, and, like Varro, is one of the ultimate authorities for the terminology of Latin Grammar. The traditions of Varro and of Nigidius Figulus were followed by Alexander Polyhistor's pupil, C. Iulius Hyginus (d. 17 A.D.), who commented on Virgil and presided over the Palatine library.

1241. The earliest of Latin lexicographers was Verrius Flaccus (fl. 10 B.C.), whose work *De Verborum Significatu* was valued by Varro as an authority on Roman Antiquities. All that survives is about half (M—T) of the abridgement by Festus (2nd century), and the whole of a still further abridgement by Paulus Diaconus (c. 800).

1242. The first exclusively scholastic treatise on Latin Grammar was that of Q. Remmius Palaemon (fl. 35—70 A.D.). It included rules for correct speaking, with examples from the ancient poets, and chapters on barbarism and solecism. It was the first to distinguish four declensions. Part of the purport of its teaching is preserved by the author's pupil, Quintilian, and also (in the fourth century) by Charisius. The foremost grammarian of the first century was Valerius Probus (fl. 56—88 A.D.), who produced recensions of Terence, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, and Persius, with critical symbols like those first used by the Alexandrian scholars. Most of our knowledge of these symbols is due to Suetonius, who wrote a treatise on the subject, together with brief biographies of scholars, many of which have survived (§ 1015). Probus is said to have bestowed a considerable amount of care on the collation of



the best MSS of classical authors, and he is probably the source of the references to MSS in the pages of Gellius, who takes a special interest in moot points of grammar and lexicography (§ 1022).

Gellius.

**1243.** Late in the second century we have Terentianus Maurus, the writer of a manual on metre, and Acro, the author of commentaries on Terence and on Horace, who is also expounded at a later date by Porphyrio. In the fourth century the study of Grammar begins in North Africa with Nonius Marcellus, the author of a vast Glossary containing numerous quotations from the ancient poets. In the middle of the century it culminates at Rome with Aelius Donatus, the commentator on Terence and the preceptor of St Jerome. His Grammar (which has come down to us in a longer and a shorter form) was the theme of extant commentaries by Seruius and others, and continued to be a favourite text-book in the Middle Ages. The study was continued by Charisius and Diomedes, who transmitted to posterity the grammatical teaching of Palaemon and other masters of an earlier time.

Terentianus  
Maurus.  
Acro and  
Porphyrio.  
Nonius.

Donatus.

Charisius.  
Diomedes.

**1244.** In the same century scholarship is ably represented by St Jerome, one of the most learned men of his day, the translator of the whole of the Bible, and of the Chronicle of Eusebius, and the enthusiastic student of Cicero and Virgil (§ 1029). The Latin Classics were also keenly appreciated by an adherent of the old Roman religion, the orator Symmachus, who inspired his friends, Valerianus and the Nicomachi, with an interest in the textual criticism of Livy. This is proved by the *subscriptiones* in the MSS of the first decade. We have similar evidence as to the revision of the text of prose authors, such as Apuleius, Caesar, Cicero, Macrobius, Martianus Capella, Pliny the elder, Pomponius Mela, and Vegetius, and poets such as Horace, Juvenal, Lucan, Martial, Persius, Statius, and Virgil<sup>1</sup>.

St Jerome.

Symmachus.

**1245.** Symmachus and Seruius are among the interlocutors in the *Saturnalia* of Macrobius, which has for its principal theme the erudition of Virgil (§ 1035). Seruius (born c. 355) is the well-known commentator on that poet (§ 1036).

Macrobius.  
Seruius.

**1246.** Early in the fifth century (c. 410—427) a text-book of the Seven Liberal Arts was produced in Northern Africa by Martianus Capella (§ 1037), and, a century later, the Roman age closes with the transcript at Constantinople of Priscian's great work on Grammar (§ 1045). Priscian was one of the authorities followed in the treatise on *Orthography* compiled by Cassiodorus, the latter part of whose life falls within the confines of the Middle Ages (§ 1044).

Martianus  
Capella.  
Priscian.

<sup>1</sup> For authorities, cp. *History of Classical Scholarship*, i (1906) 228, n. 8, and 249, and see facsimile from a MS of Pliny the elder, p. 782 *supra*.

THE MIDDLE AGES, *c.* 529 TO *c.* 1321 A.D.

**1247.** Early in the Middle Ages, Gregory the Great (*c.* 540—604) confesses to a contempt for the art of speech, and admits that he is not unduly careful in the avoidance of barbarisms or inaccurate uses of prepositions, 'deeming it utterly unworthy to keep the language of the Divine Oracles in the rules of Donatus'. In the same century the decline of Latin learning in Gaul is attested by the writings of another Gregory, the bishop of Tours and the historian of the Franks (*c.* 538—594), who repeatedly apologises for his imperfect knowledge of Grammar, and supplies us with proof that the pronunciation of Latin had already begun to differ from its spelling; *e* was confounded with *i*, and *o* with *u*; many of the consonants were pronounced feebly, or suppressed altogether; aspiration was little observed, and a sibilant sound was introduced into *ci* and *ti*. After 600 A.D. the decadence of Latin is exemplified by the fantastic grammarian of Toulouse, who gave himself the name of Virgilius Maro. His only value lies in the way in which he illustrates the transition from Latin to its Provençal descendant, and from quantitative to rhythmical forms of verse. (His date is probably 650, after Isidore<sup>1</sup>.)

**1248.** Early in the seventh century (*c.* 613) and in the neighbourhood of Pavia, the monastery of Bobbio was founded by the Irish monk, Columban (*c.* 543—615). It long remained a home of learning for Northern Italy. Many of its mss have been dispersed among the great libraries of Rome and Turin and Milan. In 614, the monastery of St Gallen was founded above the Lake of Constance by one of Columban's comrades. and, during the Middle Ages, important Latin mss were there preserved until they were brought to light in the Revival of Learning.

**1249.** Less than twenty-five years after the foundation of Bobbio and St Gallen, Isidore, bishop of Seville (d. 636), compiled from the lost treatises of Suetonius, and from other sources, an encyclopaedic work called the *Origines* which gathered up for the Middle Ages much of the learning of the Roman world.

**1250.** Later in the same century, in England, a school was founded by Theodore of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury from 668 to 690, who made many of the monasteries of England schools of Greek and Latin learning. Among the pupils of the school at Canterbury was Aldhelm (*c.* 650—709), the future abbot of Malmesbury and bishop of Sherborne, whose lengthy dialogue on Latin prosody is enlivened with riddles in Latin verse. While Aldhelm is the father of Anglo-Latin poetry, his younger and more famous contemporary, Bede (673—735), has left his mark mainly in the field of prose. He is 'the most general scholar of his age'.

<sup>1</sup> Manitius, *Lat. Lit. des MAs*, i (1911) 121. Zimmer, *S. Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1910, p. 1067, placed him *c.* 460.

In his 'Ecclesiastical History' (731) he refers to the studies of the English in Rome, and to the collection and circulation of books in England. His contemporary, Winfrid of Crediton (675—754), better known as Boniface 'the apostle of Germany', had a lasting influence on learning in Europe through the monastery founded under his sanction at Fulda (744). It counted among its inmates Einhard (770—840), the accomplished biographer of Charles the Great; Rabanus Maurus, the earliest *praeceptor Germaniae* (776—856); and Seruatus Lupus, the scholarly abbot of Ferrières (805—862). Important monasteries were founded in the same century at Reichenau (724) and Murbach (727), and at Lorsch (763) and Hersfeld (768). The Westphalian monastery of Corvey (822) derived its name from Corbie on the Somme (662). Among other famous monasteries in France were those at Tours (372), Fleury (620), Ferrières (630), and Cluni (910).

Boniface and  
Fulda.

1251. The revival of learning under Charles the Great (768—814) is associated with the name of Paulus Diaconus (*c.* 725—797), the abbreviator of Festus (§ 1241 *supra*), and far more with that of Alcuin of York (*c.* 735—804), who presided over the Palace School from 782 to 790, and was abbot of St Martin's at Tours from 796 to his death. The minuscule mss characteristic of that time have been already mentioned (§ 1158). About 845 Charles the Bald placed at the head of the Palace School the foremost philosopher of the early Middle Ages, the Irishman known as John the Scot. One of his younger contemporaries, Remi of Auxerre, opened a school in Paris in 900. His commentaries on the Catechism of Donatus and on Martianus Capella are still extant.

Paulus Diaconus,  
Alcuin.

John the  
Scot, Remi.

1252. The ninth century closes in England with the name of Alfred, who is 'our first translator', the Latin authors rendered by him including the History of Orosius and the *Philosophiae Consolatio* of Boëthius. In Germany, Boëthius, as well as Terence, was imitated in the six moral and religious plays composed in the next century by Hroswitha, the learned nun of Gandersheim (*f.* 984), who wrote her plays in prose, as there was nothing in the mss to show that Terence wrote in verse. In France, the foremost scholar of the century was Gerbert of Aurillac, afterwards Pope Sylvester II (d. 1003), whose Letters give ample proof of his familiarity with Sallust, Caesar and Suetonius, and (above all) with Cicero. It has even been surmised that the preservation of Cicero's speeches in France may have been largely due to Gerbert. In England, one of his younger contemporaries, Ælfric, the abbot of Eynsham near Oxford (*c.* 955—*c.* 1030), was the main supporter of bishop Ethelwold in making Winchester famous as a place of education, and it was there that he began his *Latin Grammar*, including extracts translated from Priscian and followed by a *Glossary*, which is the earliest Latin-English

Alfred the  
Great.

Hroswitha.

Gerbert of  
Aurillac.

Ælfric of  
Eynsham.

dictionary in existence. The year 1000 marks the transition from one of the darkest centuries of the Middle Ages to one that was in the main a period of progress culminating in the intellectual revival of the twelfth century.

**1253.** In France, the school of Chartres was first famous in the eleventh

John of  
Salisbury.

century. Its fame in the following century still lives in the pages of John of Salisbury (1110—1180), who, in all the Latin literature accessible to him, was the best read scholar of his age. It was for the schools of Paris that Joannes de Garlandia, an Englishman by birth and a Frenchman by adoption (*fl.* 1230), composed three Latin vocabularies and

Joannes de  
Garlandia.

other works which are still extant. Elementary grammars in Latin verse were composed by Eberhard of Bethune (*fl.* 1212) and by Alexander of Ville-Dieu (d. 1240), and remained in use until the Revival of Learning.

Vincent of  
Beauvais.

In the same century the varied erudition of the Middle Ages is well exemplified by the vast encyclopaedia known as the *Speculum Mundi* of Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264). His

quotations from Tibullus are derived from certain excerpts earlier than any complete MSS of that author now extant.

**1254.** It is primarily to the monasteries of the West that we are indebted for the survival of the Latin Classics<sup>1</sup>. While the

The survival  
of the  
Classics.

reading of pagan authors had been discouraged by the founders of the monastic orders, no restriction had been placed on the copying of MSS, and the work of the monastic schools would naturally involve the reproduction of a certain number of classical texts, while others owe their survival solely to their literary interest.

**1255.** The grammarians of the Middle Ages dealt with Latin as the living language of the Church and the schools, and it was

Mediaeval  
Latin.

precisely because it was a living language that it departed more and more from the classical standard. The Mediaeval

Latin prose had been founded on the Fathers and on the Vulgate, while it enlarged its vocabulary by incorporating the names of things unknown to the ancients, together with technical terms of the schools, whether invented by the schoolmen or by the grammarians. In the educational system of the time, which goes back, in its origin, at least as far as Varro (§ 963),

The Arts and  
the Authors.

Grammar, combined with Logic and Rhetoric, formed the *trivium*, which was followed by the *quadrivium*, consisting of Music, Arithmetic, Geometry, and Astronomy. In the

thirteenth century in particular, the schools of France were the battleground of a struggle between the study of the 'Seven Arts' (especially that of dialectic) and the study of the Classical Authors. While the study of the arts flourished in the schools of Paris, that of the authors was maintained at Orleans and at Chartres. This struggle is vividly represented in Henri of Andely's *Battle of the Seven Arts* (after 1236), in which the

<sup>1</sup> Details as to each author in *History of Classical Scholarship*, i (1906) 617—663.



conflict between the study of philosophy in Paris and the cultivation of poetical literature at Orleans is represented as a battle between the forces of Logic and those of Grammar, who summons all the classical authors to her aid. In the end the Muse of poetry buries herself out of sight, but the poet prophesies that the next generation 'will once more give heed to grammar'; and, in the early years of the next century, this prophecy was fulfilled by the Revival of Learning associated with the age of Petrarch.

THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING, *c.* 1321 TO *c.* 1527.

**1256.** Petrarch (1304—1374) in his early youth was enraptured with the style of Cicero and of Virgil. Virgil had been the favourite author of the Middle Ages; it was the influence of Petrarch that restored Cicero to a position of prominence. At Verona in 1345 he found a ms containing all the *Letters* to Atticus and Quintus and the correspondence with Brutus. It was not until 1392 that Coluccio Salutati (1330—1406) was the first of modern scholars to possess a transcript of the whole of Cicero's *Letters*. He also possessed a copy of Cato's treatise on Agriculture.

The Revival of  
Learning:  
Petrarch.

**1257.** Under the influence of Petrarch, Boccaccio (1313—1375) began to study the Latin Classics. He was first of all the humanists to quote Varro, and it is probable that he obtained from Monte Cassino the earliest archetype of that author. He also discovered the *Ibis* of Ovid, besides Martial, Ausonius, the *Appendix Vergiliana*, and the *Priapeia*. The Medicean ms of the *Histories* and the latter part of the *Annals* was possibly originally obtained by Boccaccio from Monte Cassino. He is certainly the earliest humanist who is at all familiar with the text of Tacitus.

Boccaccio.

**1258.** The quest for classical mss was extended beyond the bounds of Italy during the Council of Constance (1414—18). Foremost in the quest was one of the papal secretaries, Poggio Bracciolini (1380—1459). His discoveries were connected with four distinct expeditions. (1) At Cluni, in 1415, he found an ancient ms of Cicero's *Speeches*, including not only the *pro Cluentio*, *pro Sexto Roscio*, and *pro Murena*, but also the *pro Milone* and *pro Caelio*. (2) At St Gallen, in 1416, he discovered a complete copy of Quintilian, a ms of Valerius Flaccus (i—iv 317), and the commentary of Asconius on five *Speeches* of Cicero. (3) A second expedition to St Gallen, early in 1417, led to the discovery of a new ms of Vegetius. Lucretius was found in 'a distant monastery'. The other finds included Manilius, Silius Italicus, and Ammianus Marcellinus (xiv—xxxi). (4) In the summer of 1417, he discovered (probably at Langres) Cicero *pro Caecina*, and, in unnamed monasteries of France or Germany, seven other *Speeches*, namely the three *de lege agraria*, the two entitled *pro Rabirio*, with those *pro Roscio Comedo* and *In Pisonem*. The discovery of the *Silvae* of Statius has also been ascribed to this expedition.

Poggio.

**1259.** In 1421 a complete copy of Cicero, *De Oratore*, *Brutus*, and *Orator*, was discovered by Gerardo Landriani in an ancient chest in his cathedral church at Lodi, and, in the following year, a transcript of the newly discovered *Brutus* was made by Flavio Biondo (1388—1463), the author of four great works on the Antiquities and History of Rome and Italy. In 1429, a MS of Plautus, including twelve plays previously unknown, was brought from Germany; and in the same year the MS of Frontinus on the Aqueducts of Rome was found by Poggio himself at Monte Cassino. In 1434 Cornelius Nepos was discovered by Traversari in Padua. In the previous year the younger Pliny's *Panegyric* on Trajan was found by Aurispa at Mainz. A Paris MS including the *Correspondence with Trajan* was used for editions published in 1502 and 1508, and was afterwards lost. Shortly before 1509 another MS, the only extant authority for all the nine Books, was brought from Germany (probably from Corvey). It is written by the same hand, and was once bound up in the same volume, as the Medicean MS of the first six Books of the *Annals* of Tacitus. Meanwhile, a MS of the *Agricola*, *Germania* and *Dialogus* had been brought from Hersfeld in 1455. Eight leaves from the *Agricola* (formerly part of this MS) were found near Ancona in 1902.

**1260.** A distinct originality on certain important points is the characteristic of Laurentius Valla (1407—1457), who, in early life, deliberately preferred the style of Quintilian to that of Cicero, and subsequently protested against the superstitious reverence paid to mediaeval schoolmen and to modern lawyers. In 1440, by his denunciation of the alleged 'Donation of Constantine', he became one of the founders of historical criticism. In his widely studied *Elegantiae Latini Sermonis* (c. 1444), he attacked the barbarous Latinity of the Middle Ages and of his own day, and set up a far loftier standard of style, thus dealing a death-blow to the natural and colloquial use of the living language, and unconsciously promoting the growth of a servile Ciceronianism. He astounded some of his contemporaries by even questioning the accuracy of the 'Vulgate'. Late in life, however, under the patronage of the earliest of the humanist popes, Nicolas V, he became a papal *scriptor*, and devoted his mastery of Latin prose to the translation of Thucydides, Herodotus and the *De Corona* of Demosthenes. Many of his corrections of Livy xxi—xxvi now form part of the current text. Valla's partiality for Quintilian had its counterpart during the next half-century at Florence in the special attention paid by Politian (1454—1494) to the Silver Age of Latinity, as represented by Quintilian and the *Silvae* of Statius. He was interested in the textual criticism of the Latin poets, besides making a special study of the celebrated MS of the *Pandects* in the Medicean Library. Among his pupils were Leo X and Linacre.

**1261.** A pupil of Valla, Pomponius Laetus (1425—1498), the founder of the Roman Academy, produced the first edition of Varro *De lingua*

*Latina*, and of Curtius (c. 1471), besides commenting on the whole of Virgil, editing Sallust and the younger Pliny, annotating Columella and Quintilian, and paying special attention to Festus and Nonius. Among the pupils of Vittorino, the admirable master of the school at Mantua, was Giovanni Andrea de' Bussi (1417—1475), the future bishop of Aleria, who had the unique distinction of producing, in 1409 to 1491, the first printed editions of as many as eight works of Latin literature:—Apuleius, Gellius, Caesar, Lucan, Livy, Cicero *ad Atticum* and *Orationes*, and Silius Italicus, and possibly also the first edition of Virgil (c. 1469)<sup>1</sup>. Aldus Manutius (1449—1515), the founder of the Venetian Academy of 'New Hellenists', was far more famous as a printer of Greek than of Latin *editiones principes*. The latter were represented only by his Prosper and Sedulius (1502), but he did much for the popularisation of the Latin Classics by the publication of handy editions in the 'Aldine' or 'Italic' type first used in 1501 in his Virgil, Horace, Juvenal and Persius. His youngest son, the printer and scholar, Paulus Manutius (1512—1574), published a complete edition of Cicero, and commented on Cicero's *Letters*. Meanwhile, the two centuries of the Revival of Learning in Italy had been closed by the appalling sack of Rome (1527), which brought untold disasters on the scholars of that day. 'The fall of Rome', wrote Erasmus, 'was not the fall of the city, but of the world'.

Pomponius Laetus.

Andrea de' Bussi.

Aldus Manutius.

Paulus Manutius.

The sack of Rome.

## THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

1262. Before we trace the further fortunes of Latin learning in the nations of Europe, our attention is arrested by the cosmopolitan scholar, Erasmus (1466—1536), who, while he was a native of the Netherlands, was even more closely connected with Italy, with France and England, Germany and Switzerland, than with the land of his birth. His lucid text-books of Syntax and Style soon superseded the dull mediaeval manuals, and selections from his Latin *Colloquies* are still in use at the present day. He wrote the preface to the first edition of Livy (that of Grynaeus), which included Books xli—xlv (1531). The Latin classics which he edited in person comprised Seneca (ed. 2, 1529), the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, Suetonius, Curtius, and the elder Pliny, besides Terence and certain works of Cicero. Cicero and Terence were his main models of pure Latinity. In his celebrated dialogue on Latin style, called the *Ciceronianus* (1528), he vigorously protests against limiting the cultivation of modern Latin prose to a slavish reproduction of the words and phrases, and even the very inflexions, of Cicero. But in the

Erasmus.

<sup>1</sup> For a chronological conspectus of *Editiones Principes of Latin Authors*, see *History of Classical Scholarship*, ii 103.

preface he explains that he had no desire to deter students from attempting to imitate the style of the great Roman orator, and, only two years before his death, he writes: 'Certainly I have never loved Cicero more than I do now'.

1263. In the Latin scholarship of Italy from 1527 to 1600, the earliest event is the publication in 1527 of Vida's didactic poem *De Arte Poëtica*, a widely influential work which accepts the *Ars Poëtica* of Horace as the text-book of literary criticism, and finds the true model of epic poetry in the *Æneid*. Cicero's philosophical and rhetorical writings were ably edited, and the textual criticism of his Letters signally promoted, by Petrus Victorius (1499—1585), the foremost representative of classical learning in the *saeculum Victorianum*. The middle of that century is associated with the discovery of the *Fasti Consulares* in the Roman forum in 1546—7. They were permanently placed in the palace of the Conservatori on the Capitol and were accordingly described as the *Fasti Capitolini*; and they were edited in 1555 by Robortelli and Sigonius. Robortelli (1516—1567) was the founder of the science of textual criticism: his short treatise on this subject was the first of its kind (1557). Earlier in his career he had specially studied the *Ars Poëtica* of Horace in connexion with his edition of the *Poetics* of Aristotle (1548), and his disquisition on the Names of the Romans, published in the same year, brought him into conflict with Sigonius (*c.* 1524—1584). That eminent scholar was the author of important works on Roman History and Antiquities. He was also the editor of Livy, and of the fragments of Cicero, and the forger of the *Consolatio*, which he solemnly maintained was the work of the Roman orator (1583). Twenty-five years previously, he had apparently indulged in a similar mystification by publishing what is generally regarded as his own Commentary on the Agrarian Orations under the name of a patrician of Venice, Bernardo Loredano<sup>2</sup>.

The study of Cicero's language was permanently facilitated by the Lexicon of Nizolius (1498—1566) first published at Brescia under a different title in 1535, while Ciceronian style was admirably represented by Muretus (1526—1585), a native of France, who spent the last thirty years of his life in Italy. In Venice he produced editions of Terence and Horace, as well as Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius; and in Rome (as well as in Venice) he edited and expounded various portions of Cicero. His *Variae*

<sup>1</sup> On Ciceronianism, see *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning*, 145—173.

<sup>2</sup> Bern. Lauredani in Cic. oratt. de lege agraria...commentarius. Venetiis, Paulus Manutius, 1558. 'Commentarium hunc melioribus adnumerandum scripsit Car. Sigonius, non Lauredanus, patricius Venetus' (Orelli, *Onomasticon Cic.*, i 254); 'saepe auctor ad Sigonium prouocat et eum laudibus cumulat' (A. C. Clark, *Cic. pro Quintio* etc., 1909, p. xv).



*Lectiones* and his *Orationes* were long regarded as perfect models for modern Latin prose. Scaliger describes Muretus as desiring to imitate the diffuseness of the modern Italians, but he also places him second in style to Cicero alone<sup>1</sup>. During the twenty years in which he lectured under severe restrictions in Rome, he foresaw the decline of learning in Italy and made every effort to arrest it.

In the lucidity and the diffuseness of his Latin, and in other ways, Muretus had a close resemblance to the scholars trained by the Jesuits. The foundation of the 'Society of Jesus' was approved by the Pope in 1540, and, among the *litterae humaniores diuersarum linguarum* recognised in the *Ratio Studiorum* of Aquaviva (1599), which remained absolutely unaltered for centuries, the principal place was always assigned to Latin, as the language of the Society and of the Roman Church. The schools of the Jesuits became, to a large extent, seminaries of good silver Latin, the Latin Grammar, which remained long in use in all of them, being that of Alvarez, the Jesuit Rector of the school at Lisbon (1572). In these schools far more pains were spent on the study of the style than on that of the subject-matter of the 'pagan' classics.

1264. The Revival of Learning in France was greatly promoted by the introduction of printing. The first book printed in France, by printers from Germany, was a small volume of Ciceronian letters composed by an Italian humanist, Gasparino da Barzizza (1470). The principal aim of the humanists in the first, or *Italian*, period of modern Latin scholarship had been the imitation and reproduction of classical models of style. The second, or *French*, period is marked by a wide erudition rather than any special cult of form. It begins with the foundation of the Collège de France by Francis I in 1530, at the prompting of Budaeus (1467—1540). Budaeus is best known as a Greek scholar. His Latin style was founded on the study of Cicero. By his commentary on the Pandects (1508) he opened a new era in the study of Roman law, and he also broke fresh ground as the first serious student of Roman coinage (1515). His younger contemporary, Robert Estienne, or Robertus Stephanus (1503—1559), published a great *Thesaurus* of Latin, which, in its final form, filled three folio volumes (1543). His still more famous son, Henri Estienne (d. 1598), the editor of the celebrated Greek *Thesaurus*, printed editions of no less than fifty-eight Latin authors.

1265. The elder and less famous Scaliger, Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484—1558), was a native of Italy who spent the larger part of his life in France. In 1531—6, acting in the supposed interests of the study of Cicero, he vehemently attacked the *Ciceronianus* of Erasmus. He showed a far sounder judgement in his critical work *De Causis Latinae linguae* (1544); a far finer taste in his

The Jesuits.

Alvarez.

France from  
1470 to 1600.

Budaeus.

Julius Caesar  
Scaliger.

<sup>1</sup> *Scaligerana sec.*, pp. 163 f.

systematic treatise on Poetry (1561), though he there prefers Virgil to Homer, and declares 'Seneca inferior to none of the Greeks in majesty'. Less violent than the elder Scaliger's attacks on Erasmus was the dialogue

Dolet.

Dolet, 'the martyr of the Renaissance' (1509—1546), whose *Commentarii* (1536—8) were mainly concerned with Ciceronian usage. In the next generation the text of the whole of Cicero was boldly and brilliantly edited in 1566 by Lambinus (1520—1572), who also won a wide reputation by his important commentaries on Horace, Lucretius and Cornelius Nepos, and on all the extant plays of Plautus (ed. 1576).

Lambinus.

Cujas.

Denys and

Jacques

Godefroy.

The historical study of Roman law was founded in France by Jacques Cujas (1522—1590). The *Corpus Iuris Civilis* was ably edited by Denys Godefroy (1549—1621), and the Theodosian Code by his son, Jacques (1587—1652). The latter, a work in six folio volumes involving the labour of no less than thirty years, was 'much used' by Gibbon, who describes it as 'a full and capacious repository of the political state of the empire in the fourth and fifth centuries'.

The first important text of Juvenal and Persius was published in 1585 by Pierre Pithou (1539—1596), who was then the owner of the famous MS of those poets now at Montpellier. He also produced the *editiones principes* of the *Peruigilium Veneris* (1577), the Edict of Theodoric (1579), and Saluianus (1580) and Phaedrus (1596).

1266. The greatest scholar of the age, Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540—1609), the son of Julius Caesar Scaliger, was, in the early part of his career, a critic of Latin texts, and, in particular, of Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (1577). He had already given proof of his acumen in his remarkable edition of Festus (1575).

Joseph Justus  
Scaliger.

After he had thus made his mark in the narrow but not inglorious field of textual criticism, he broke new ground as an explorer of the broad domains of ancient history and of the contents of the classics. The transition is indicated by his edition of Manilius (1579, etc.), where his criticism of the text, however brilliant it may be, is partially eclipsed by his interest in the astronomy of the ancients. This larger interest led to the publication of his two important works on Chronology. The first of these was the folio volume *De Emendatione Temporum* (1583). Seven years later he left France for Leyden, where he produced editions of Apuleius (1600) and Caesar (1606), and, in the latter year, his great *Thesaurus Temporum*, the groundwork of which was Jerome's translation of the Chronicle of Eusebius. While Scaliger thus framed a critical chronology of the ancient world, it

Casaubon.

was reserved for Isaac Casaubon (1559—1614) to lay the foundations of a systematic knowledge of ancient life and manners. Casaubon is better known as a Greek than as a Latin scholar. But he edited Suetonius and the *Historiae Augustae Scriptores*; one of his

masterpieces was his commentary on Persius, and he also wrote a memorable monograph proving, once for all, that the Roman *satura* had no connexion with the Greek satyric drama. Scaliger once said of Casaubon :—*est doctissimus omnium qui hodie uiuunt*<sup>1</sup>, and Casaubon wrote of Scaliger after his death :—*nihil est quod discere quisquam uellet, quod ille docere non posset; nihil legerat, (quid autem ille non legerat?) quod non statim meminisset*<sup>2</sup>.

1267. The scholar whom Scaliger succeeded at Leyden was the great Latinist, Justus Lipsius (1547—1606), who published his important edition of Tacitus at Antwerp in 1574, was  
Lipsius.  
honorary professor of History at Leyden from 1579 to 1591, and ultimately returned to Louvain, the university of his youth, and there lectured to large classes on the Roman historians and on Seneca. He edited Plautus as well as Seneca, together with Valerius Maximus, Velleius Paterculus, and the younger Pliny's *Panegyric* on Trajan. His corrections of the text of Tacitus were repeatedly confirmed by the readings of the Medicean mss. He is described by Ruhnken as *perfectus litteris Latinis, Graecarum mediocriter peritus*<sup>3</sup>.

1268. Turning to England, we may recall for a moment the 'Early Renaissance', when English ecclesiastics learnt Latin from Guarino at Ferrara. We find, however, a far more effective link between England and the Italian Revival in the person of Thomas Linacre (c. 1460—1524), who was born about the year of Guarino's death. Linacre studied Latin under Politian in Florence during a visit to Italy which began in 1485 and apparently lasted until 1499. Apart from his Latin translations from Galen, this eminent physician produced no less than three Latin Grammars :—(1) the *Progymnasmata Grammatices Vulgaria*, prepared for St Paul's School in 1512, but rejected in favour of Colet and Lily's *Absolutissimus de octo partium constructione libellus*, printed by Pynson in 1513; (2) the *Rudimenta Grammatices* (c. 1523), translated into Latin by Buchanan (1533); and (3) the important treatise *De Emendata Structura Latini Sermonis* (1524), recommended by Melanchthon for use in the schools of Germany<sup>4</sup>. More than forty years later, Roger Ascham (1515—1568), Fellow of St John's and Public Orator of Cambridge, maintained, in his posthumously published *Schole-master* (1570), that the best method of learning Latin was that of translation and retranslation, and set forth the rules for the imitation of Latin authors laid down by Cheke. In the same age Latin scholarship was well represented by George Buchanan (1506—1582), whose version of the Psalms (1566) remained long in use in the schools of Scotland.  
England:  
Linacre.  
Ascham.  
Scotland:  
Buchanan.

<sup>1</sup> *Scaligerana (secunda)*, p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> *Ad Thuanum* 3 kal. Quintil. 1610.

<sup>3</sup> *Elogium Hemsterhusii*, p. 46 (ed. 1789).

<sup>4</sup> Facsimiles from all three Grammars in Osler's *Thomas Linacre*, Cambridge, 1908, p. 30 f, and pl. ix, x, xi.

1269. Meanwhile, in Germany, the Italian humanists had been brilliantly represented at the court of the emperor Frederick III in the person of Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (afterwards Pope Pius II), who spent thirteen years in Vienna (1442-55). It was in the next generation, and with reference mainly to Northern Germany, that Rodolphus Agricola (1444-1485), a native of the Netherlands, who studied at Paris and Ferrara, was described by Erasmus as 'the first who brought from Italy some breath of a better culture'. He became the 'standard-bearer' of humanism in Germany. Late in life he resided at Heidelberg. Another important literary centre was Basel, where valuable editions of Latin historians were published with the aid of newly-discovered MSS:—the *editio princeps* of Velleius Paterculus (1520), and editions of Livy (1531 and 1535) and Ammianus Marcellinus (1533).

At Basel, at the age of twenty, Reuchlin (1455-1522) produced a brief Latin dictionary, which, in less than thirty years, passed through twenty editions. It was in the defence of Reuchlin that the barbarous Latinity and the mediaeval scholasticism of his opponents were admirably parodied in the *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum* (1516-7).

In the next generation, Melanchthon (1497-1560), the *praeceptor Germaniae*, lectured at Wittenberg on Virgil, Terence, and the rhetorical works of Cicero, and produced many elementary editions of the Classics, and a Latin Grammar, which remained long in use. His friend Camerarius (1500-1574) is best known through the edition of Plautus (1552) which he founded on two important MSS, both of which were then in Heidelberg. In critical acumen he holds one of the foremost places among the German scholars of the sixteenth century.

#### THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

1270. In the seventeenth century the classical learning of Italy was mainly limited to archaeology. Latin Composition was, however, agreeably represented by the *Prolusiones* (1617) of the Roman Jesuit, Famianus Strada (1572-1649), tastefully dealing with large questions of style in prose and poetry, and illustrating that of Lucretius, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius and Claudian by original poems in imitation of those poets.

1271. In France, the high promise of Salmasius (1588-1653), a native of Saumur, was early recognised by Casaubon. In his edition of the *Historiae Augustae Scriptores* (1620) he distinguished himself less as a sound textual critic than as an erudite commentator; and, in his *Plinianae Exercitationes* (1629), he devoted more than 900 pages to the elucidation of those portions of Pliny which



are included in the geographical compendium of Solinus. In 1632 he was invited to fill the chair of Scaliger, which had been left vacant at Leyden since 1609, and he there produced his learned antiquarian treatise *De Usuris* (1638). His erudition was proverbial. Balzac the elder said of him to Ménage:—*non homini, sed scientiæ deest quod nesciuit Salmasius*<sup>1</sup>.

The monumental Glossary of mediæval Latin, originally published in three folio volumes (1678), was the principal work of the erudite historian, Du Cange (1610—1688), a parliamentary barrister who devoted himself mainly to historical studies at his birth-place, Amiens, and in Paris. Among his most intimate friends in Paris was Mabillon (1632—1707), who, for the last 43 years of his life, was a member of the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, in the south of Paris, and laid the foundations of the science of Latin palæography in his folio volume *De Re Diplomatica* (1681). His contemporary, Pierre Daniel Huet of Caen (1630—1721), afterwards bishop of Avranches, was in 1670–80 associated with Bossuet in the tuition of the Grand Dauphin, the son of Louis XIV, and was the organiser and general editor of the Delphin Classics (1670–80).

1272. In the Netherlands one of the earliest representatives of learning during the seventeenth century was the great 'Polyhistor', Gerard John Vossius (1577—1649). His treatise on Rhetoric (1606) ultimately filled 1000 quarto pages. His Latin Grammar of 1607 was repeatedly reprinted in Holland and Germany. His *Aristarchus* is a more learned and scholarly work on the same general subject (1635). He also wrote on Latin style, produced important treatises on the historians of Greece and Rome, and was the author of a widely influential treatise on Poetry (1647).

Among the most devoted pupils of Scaliger was the Latin orator and poet, Daniel Heinsius (c. 1580—1655), an editor of Silius, Horace, Seneca's tragedies, Terence, Ovid, Livy and Virgil, whose conjectures on the text of Horace were disapproved by Bentley, while those on Silius, on Seneca's tragedies, and on Ovid, though not much more valuable, were held in high esteem by his contemporaries and by his immediate successors. Scaliger divined the future greatness of Grotius (1583—1645), who, apart from his classic work *De Iure Belli et Pacis*, edited Martianus Capella at the age of 16, and Lucan and Silius in his maturer years, and is still remembered by scholars for his admirable Latin versions from the Planudean Anthology (first published in 1795–6). In the next generation we have J. F. Gronovius (1611—1671), whose editions mark an epoch in the study of Livy (1645), Gellius, Statius, Martial, and Plautus. He also edited both the Senecas, Sallust, the elder Pliny, Phædrus, and Tacitus. He is lauded by Wytttenbach as *Latinitatis scientiæ princeps*, while our own Markland went so far as to prophesy:—

<sup>1</sup> *Menagiana*, i 312, ed. 1715.

Du Cange.

Mabillon.

Huet.

The  
Netherlands:  
G. J. Vossius.

D. Heinsius.

Grotius.

J.F.Gronovius.

*Nunquam interituram esse ueram eruditionem, donec Gronouii opera legentur*<sup>1</sup>.

**N. Heinsius.** His younger contemporary, N. Heinsius (1620—1681), the only son of Daniel, was, for the larger part of his career, engaged in diplomatic and political work. The only writer of Latin prose edited by him was Velleius Paterculus, but his editions of Claudian, Ovid (1652), Virgil, Prudentius and Valerius Flaccus, earned for him the title of

*sospitator poetarum Latinorum*. Graevius (1632—1703), who spent the last forty years of his strenuous life at Utrecht, is

mainly known as an editor of Cicero, and of Justin, Suetonius, Florus, and Caesar. He compiled an enormous collection of the works of his predecessors in the twelve folio volumes of his *Thesaurus* of Roman, and the nine volumes of his *Thesaurus* of Italian Antiquities, continued (with fifteen more) by the elder Burman. Six years after the publication of Bentley's *Letter to Mill* (1691), the aged Graevius was one of the first to hail the dawn of Bentley's fame as the *nouum sed splendidissimum Britanniae lumen*.

Propertius was imitated, as well as edited, by Broukhusius (1647—1707), while Ovid was the favourite model of his friend the soldier-scholar, Francius (1645—1704). The Latin orations of the latter were unwarrantably attacked by the learned Perizonius, whose true strength lay in historical criticism. His *Animadversiones Historicae* (1685) anticipated Niebuhr's method of dealing with the early history of Rome.

**1273.** The spirit of enterprise which marked the reign of Queen Elizabeth was fully shared by the Tudor translators, but very few of them were scholars. An exception may, however, be made in favour of Arthur Golding, whose translation of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1565 f) was familiar to Shakespeare, and who also translated Caesar, Justin, Seneca *De Beneficiis*, Pomponius Mela and Solinus; Henry Savile, the future Provost of Eton and Warden of Merton, the accurate but unidiomatic translator of the *Histories* and the *Agricola* of Tacitus (1591); and Philemon Holland, the physician and Fellow of Trinity, Cambridge, who, by his renderings of the whole of Livy, Pliny, Suetonius, and Ammianus Marcellinus in 1600—9, earned the title of 'the translator general in his age'. Horace was edited by the physician and politician,

John Bond (1606); and Juvenal and Persius, Martial and Lucan, Seneca's *Tragedies* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, by Ben Jonson's friend, the able schoolmaster, Thomas Farnaby, who, in 1641 (at the command of Charles I), prepared a Latin Grammar of a learned type. A similar Grammar was produced in 1679 by William Baxter, the editor of Horace (1701). Dryden's verse-translation of Virgil, which had appeared shortly before, in 1697, contains many fine lines, but is perhaps less successful than his vigorous renderings of Horace, Persius, and Juvenal.

<sup>1</sup> *Praefatio* to Statius, *Siluae*, p. xi.

1274. Germany (as well as England and the Netherlands) claims a part in the career of Janus Gruter (1560—1627), who was born in Antwerp, educated at Norwich and Cambridge, and at Leyden, and spent the last thirty-five years of his life at Heidelberg. He edited at least seventeen Latin authors. In his *Livy* he introduced the division into chapters still in use. The *Corpus* of ancient inscriptions, which bears his name, was begun at the suggestion of Scaliger, who supplied a considerable part of the materials and equipped it with twenty-four admirable indices (1603). A characteristic product of the same century is the vast survey of classical learning included in the *Polyhistor* of Daniel George Morhof (1639—1690).

Germany:  
Gruter.

Morhof.

#### THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

1275. In the first half of the eighteenth century the foremost classical scholar of Europe was Richard Bentley, who was born in 1662, was educated at St John's College, Cambridge, and was Master of Trinity from 1700 to his death in 1742. As an example of critical method, his *Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris* (1697; ed. 2, 1699) marks an epoch in the history of scholarship. In 1711 he published his memorable edition of Horace, in which he altered the ordinary text in more than 700 passages. *Nobis et ratio et res ipsa* (he declares) *centum codicibus potiores sunt*<sup>1</sup>. Nevertheless, he duly recognised the value of the recorded readings of the *codex antiquissimus Blandinius* which perished in the burning of the Benedictine monastery of Blandenberg in Ghent<sup>2</sup>. His Horace was followed in 1726 by a highly original edition of Terence, in which he corrected the text in about 1000 places, mainly on grounds of metre, a subject satisfactorily expounded for the first time in the *Schediasma* prefixed to the same volume (which includes Publilius Syrus and Phaedrus). He also left his mark on the textual criticism of Plautus, Lucretius, and Lucan; his latest work was his recension of Manilius (1739). Bentley had a wide range of first-hand knowledge of the Greek as well as the Latin Classics; he clearly saw that textual criticism must be founded on a thorough knowledge of the history of the manuscript text; and he never failed to discriminate promptly between the true and the false in solving a series of important problems in the history of ancient literature.

The 18th  
century.  
England:  
Bentley.

We cannot wonder that Bentley's judgement and sagacity were lauded by his friend the metaphysician<sup>3</sup>, Dr Samuel Clarke, in his folio edition of Caesar (1712). In the latter half of the same century we have the notable name of Edward Gibbon (1737—1794), who, in the early part of his career, read the whole of

S. Clarke.  
Gibbon.

<sup>1</sup> Note on *Carm.* iii 27, 15.

<sup>2</sup> Note on *Serm.* i 6, 126; cp. *Classical Review*, xxii 204.

<sup>3</sup> Another friend of Bentley, Jeremiah Markland (1693—1776), produced an important edition of the *Silvae* of Statius (1728).

Cicero, and the Latin Classics in general, at Lausanne, where, on the night of the 27th of June, 1787, in the summer-house of his garden overlooking the lake of Geneva, he wrote the last lines of his immortal work on the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. The century closes with

Alexander Adam (1741—1809), the author of an excellent work on *Roman Antiquities* (1791), and with Sir William Jones (1746—1794), who, in 1786, after his first glance at Sanskrit in India, declared that ‘no philologer could examine the Sanscrit, Greek, and Latin (languages), without believing them to have been sprung from some common source’, thus proving himself a far-sighted pioneer in the yet unknown domain of Comparative Philology.

1276. In 1575 the University of Leyden had been founded in the northern Netherlands in memory of the beleaguered town’s heroic resistance to the forces of Spain; and, early in its history, from 1579 to 1591, Lipsius, who began and ended his academic activity at Louvain, was an honorary Professor at Leyden during part of the Protestant parenthesis in his Catholic career. Subsequently, the learning of the Netherlands was twice reinforced from France, when the chair vacated by Lipsius was filled by Scaliger from 1593 to 1609, and by Salmasius from 1631 to 1653; and the primacy in scholarship thus passed from France to the Netherlands. The two centuries between the call of Scaliger to Leyden in 1593 and the publication of Wolf’s ‘*Prolegomena to Homer*’ in 1795 were an age of high distinction in Dutch scholarship; and for half a century (between 1691 and 1741) Bentley was the most prominent figure during the age of historical and literary as well as verbal criticism known as the ‘English and Dutch’ period of classical learning. But Bentley had a far greater influence on the Greek than on the Latin scholarship of Holland. His friend and ally

Pieter Burman (1668—1741) went on producing ponderous editions of Phaedrus, Horace, Valerius Flaccus, Claudian, Ovid, Lucan, Virgil, and the *Poëtae Latini Minores*, as well as Petronius, Velleius Paterculus, Quintilian, Justin and Suetonius. ‘*Variorum* editions’ were not actually invented by him, but they gained a new vogue through the enormous powers of work which made him the ‘beast of burden’ of classical learning. As an editor of the Latin poets, he was equal to N. Heinsius in erudition, but inferior to him in acumen and emendatory skill. An admirably annotated edition of the whole of Livy was published in seven quarto volumes by Arnold Drakenborch (1684—

Drakenborch.  
Oudendorp.  
Burman II.

1748), professor at Utrecht. The last of the great Latinists of this age in Holland was Oudendorp (1696—1761), the editor of Lucan, and of Frontinus, Caesar, and Suetonius. Pieter Burman’s nephew and namesake, Burman II (1714—1778), is best known as the editor of the *Anthologia Latina*.

1277. Some of the greatest achievements of Italian scholarship in this century were connected with Latin lexicography. Jacopo Facciolati (1682



—1709) and Aegidio Forcellini (1688—1768) were both of them pupils of the Seminary of Padua. It was under the superintendence of Facciolati that in 1718 Forcellini began his great Latin lexicon, which was completed in 1755, but not sent to press until 1769, the year after his death. Facciolati, who survived by one year his younger contemporary, seized the opportunity to introduce his own name into the title-page, which accordingly described the lexicon as *consilio et cura Iacobi Facciolati, opera et studio Aegidii Forcellini...lucubratum*. This title, which led many to believe that the lexicon was largely the work of Facciolati, was retained until the publication of De-Vit's edition in 1858—79. Facciolati, however, deserves the credit of having been the first to give in 1738 a satisfactory form to the *Lexicon Ciceronianum* of Nizolius (§ 1263). In the same age the textual criticism of Cicero was promoted by the collation of a large number of Florentine MSS by the learned Jesuit, Girolamo Lagomarsini (1698—1773).

Italy:  
Facciolati.  
Forcellini.

Lagomarsini.

1278. In France the whole range of classical antiquities was traversed in the ten folio volumes of the *Antiquité Expliquée* (1718) of Bernard de Montfaucon (1655—1741), who, as a learned Greek palaeographer, was the counterpart of Mabillon, the Latin palaeographer of the previous century.

France:  
Montfaucon.

1279. Late in this century, the series known as the *editiones Bipontinae* (1779—1809), including 115 volumes of the Latin Classics, owes its name to its having been mainly organised by two successive Rectors of the 'gymnasium' at Zweibrücken. In 1798 the place of publication was removed to Strassburg, but scholars of Alsace (such as Brunck) had taken part in the series from the very first.

editiones  
Bipontinae.

1280. The Latinists of the eighteenth century in Germany include J. A. Fabricius (1668—1776), whose *Bibliothecae* of the classical and mediaeval periods of Latin literature are far surpassed in extent and importance by his *Bibliotheca Graeca*. One of the greatest Latin scholars of the age was J. M. Gesner (1691—1761) of Leipzig and Göttingen, who edited the *Scriptores Rei Rusticae*, Quintilian, and the younger Pliny, and traversed the whole range of classical Latin in the four folio volumes of his *Thesaurus* (1749). As a Latin lexicographer, Gesner had in the next generation a worthy successor in Scheller (1735—1803). He was himself the theme of an admirable biographical sketch by Johann August Ernesti (1707—1781), who spent the last fifty years of his life at Leipzig, leaving behind him a reputation which rested mainly on an edition of the whole of Cicero (1739), supplemented in its third issue by historical introductions and critical notes (1777), while the most permanent part of the original work is the *Clavis*. Though we are here concerned with Latin scholarship, we cannot ignore the fact that he also promoted the new interest in Homer by publishing in

Germany:  
Fabricius.

Gesner.

Scheller.  
Ernesti.

1759-64 an edition founded on that of Bentley's admirer, Samuel Clarke.

Heyne. C. G. Heyne (1729-1812), who is well known as an editor of Homer, first made his mark by a text of Tibullus (1755), followed by an important edition of Virgil (1767-75). His teaching at Göttingen derived a new life from the interest in Greek art, and in literary and artistic criticism, inspired by Winckelmann (1755) and Lessing (1766). As professor for forty-nine years, he was the founder of that branch of classical teaching that deals with 'things' as contrasted with 'words',—with archaeology (in its widest sense) as contrasted with language and literature. The study of Latin declined. In Heyne's day, Herder (who hated Latin, but was fully alive to the literary charm of Horace<sup>1</sup>) inspired Germany with a fresh enthusiasm for Greek and for Homer (1773), and, under the influence of Voss and of Goethe, the close of the century saw the triumph of the New Humanism with Homer for its hero. An increasing consciousness of the importance of Heyne's work has led to the 'German period' of classical learning being lately regarded as having been opened by Heyne rather than by F. A. Wolf (1759-1824), the author of the *Prolegomena to Homer* (1795) and the exponent of an encyclopaedic *Alterthumswissenschaft*, who was a very independent student during Heyne's time at Göttingen, and was a highly influential professor at Halle from 1783 to 1806.

#### THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

1281. In the nineteenth century German Switzerland claims a notable editor of important Latin Classics in the person of Johann Caspar Orelli of Zürich (1787-1849), who prepared a critical text of the whole of Cicero (1826-38), the second edition of which was completed in 1846-62 by Baiter of Zürich (1801-1877) and Halm of Munich (1809-1882), whose texts of Latin prose authors included Tacitus and Quintilian. Orelli is also well known as a commentator on Horace (1837-8) and on Tacitus (1846-8).

1282. In Germany, the study of the differences between classical and non-classical Latin has long been facilitated by the useful dictionary known as the *Antibarbarus*, first published in 1832 by J. P. Krebs (1771-1850) and repeatedly re-edited by Allgayer and Schmalz (7th ed. 1905). A valuable Latin Grammar, limited to classical prose, was produced in 1818 by K. G. Zumpt (1792-1849), whose work passed through many editions, until it was superseded in 1844 by that of Madvig. The differences between Latin and German prose were the theme of an illuminating treatise on Latin Style (1846; ed. 9, 1905) by Nägelsbach (1806-1859). All these three works are well known outside the land of their birth.

The 19th  
century:  
Switzerland:  
Orelli.

Germany:  
J. P. Krebs.  
K. G. Zumpt.  
Nägelsbach.

<sup>1</sup> *History of Classical Scholarship*, iii 32, 35.

A keen interest in Homer (from different points of view) is a link between Karl Friedrich Nägelsbach and Karl Lachmann (1793—1851), who began his career as a Latin scholar by a critical text of Propertius (1816), the second edition of which included Catullus and Tibullus (1829). He also edited the poem on metres by Terentianus Maurus and the fables of Avianus. His general principles as a textual critic, which are founded on a clear distinction between the two successive processes of *recensio* and *emendatio*, are set forth in the opening pages of the first and second volumes of his *Nouum Testamentum Graece et Latine* (1842—50)<sup>1</sup>. This distinction is implied, but it is not explained, in the first few pages of the second volume of Lachmann's masterly edition of Lucretius, in which the value of the two Leyden mss was, for the first time, duly recognised (1850). As professor in Berlin, he was succeeded by his friend, Moriz Haupt (1808—1874), who dealt with the textual criticism of Catullus, and edited the *Cynegetica* of Gratus and Nemesianus, besides producing editions of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius, and of Virgil, with the *Pseudo-Virgiliana* (including the *Aetna*). It was from Haupt that Nettleship first learnt to appreciate the true greatness of Bentley.

Lachmann.

Haupt.

The life of Friedrich Ritschl (1806—1876) falls into three periods, corresponding to his tenure of a professorship at Breslau (1833—9), Bonn (1839—65), and Leipzig (1865—76). In 1836—7 he spent several months in Milan, carefully examining the Ambrosian palimpsest of Plautus, which was afterwards deciphered (so far as practicable) by Ritschl's pupils, Gustav Löwe and Studemund. Ritschl's papers on Plautus, in 1841—5, won him the title of *sospitator Plauti*. In 1848—54 he edited nine plays, and entrusted the rest to three of his ablest pupils. His work on Plautus marks an epoch in the study of the text. His Plautine studies, in their turn, led him to investigate the history of the Latin language, the most important monument of his labours in this department being the folio volume entitled *Priscae latinitatis monumenta epigraphica* (1862), comprising a great collection of facsimiles and illustrating many points of Latin orthography and epigraphy. Among the numerous papers in his *Opuscula* may be mentioned the important treatise on the history of the Latin alphabet, and the valuable monographs on Varro and on the Augustan survey of the Roman empire. One of his immediate followers was Alfred Fleckeisen (1822—1899), the editor of ten plays of Plautus (1850 f) and the whole of Terence (1857). Terence was afterwards more elaborately edited by Umpfenbach (1870).

Ritschl.

Fleckeisen.  
Umpfenbach.

In Leipzig, Ritschl was succeeded by his able biographer, Otto Ribbeck (1827—1898), the author of an admirable History of Roman Poetry, and of an ingenious reconstructive work on the Tragedies of the Roman Republic, who was also the editor of a compre-

Ribbeck.

<sup>1</sup> Partly summarised in *History of Classical Scholarship*, iii 130.

hensive collection of the Fragments of the Latin Dramatists, and an important edition of Virgil, and was, lastly, the hypercritical examiner of the Epistles of Horace and the Satires of Juvenal. The Latin poets were

**L. Müller.** also the field of labour chosen by Lucian Müller (1836—1898), the author of a treatise *De Re Metrica* on the prosody of all the Latin poets except Plautus and Terence, and the editor of the Fragments of Liuius Andronicus, Ennius, Naeuius, Lucilius, of the Fables of Phaedrus, of the whole of Horace, and of the encyclopaedic work of Nonius Marcellus, which abounds in quotations from early Latin literature.

**Baehrens.** One of his rivals as an editor of Latin poets was Emil Baehrens (1848—1888), whose principal works were his *Poetae Latini Minores* and his *Fragmenta Poëtarum Latinorum*. The briefest mention must here suffice even for scholars as eminent as

**Bernhardy.**  
**Otto Jahn.**  
**Friedländer.**  
**Wölflin.**  
**Bücheler.**

Bernhardy (1800—1875), the author of an important History of Roman Literature; Otto Jahn (1813—1869), no less admirable as a classical archaeologist than as an editor of Juvenal and Persius; Friedländer (1824—1909), the editor of Juvenal and Martial, and the author of a great work on the social life of Rome; Wölflin (1831—1908), the founder of the historical study of Latin Syntax, and the editor of the *Archiv* for Latin lexicography; and Bücheler (1837—1908), the editor of Frontinus and Petronius, and of the 'Carmina Latina Epigraphica', who was also a specialist in the dialects of ancient Italy.

**1283.** Comparative philology lies beyond the scope of the present survey. We can only note in passing that the founder of the comparative study of language in Germany was Franz Bopp (1791—1867), the author of the 'Comparative Grammar' (1833). Abundant materials for the historic grammar

of Latin were supplied by the epigraphic researches of Ritschl, Mommsen, and others. These materials were used, with a constant regard to the comparative study of language, in the investigation of the changes of the Latin consonants and vowels by Wilhelm Corssen (1820—1875), who, in his work on the 'Pronunciation, Vocalisation, and Accentuation of the Latin language' (ed. 2, 1868 f), dealt with Latin in connexion with the old Italic dialects, and in the light of comparative philology. It

was the constant aim of Georg Curtius (1820—1885) to bring 'Classical Philology' and the 'Science of Language' into closer relation with each other. Schleicher, in his Compendium of Comparative Grammar, stated the results of all the recent investigations on the vocal changes in a series of 'laws of sound'. A more rigid application of the principles laid down by Curtius and Schleicher is a leading characteristic of the 'New Grammarians' of the school of Brugmann.

**1284.** In the study of Roman History a new era was opened by Niebuhr (1776—1831). His theory, that the early legends had been transmitted from generation to generation in the form of poetic lays, had been anticipated by Perizonius (§ 1272). His main results, such as his views on the origin of the *plebs*, the relation between the patricians and the plebeians, the real nature of the *ager publicus*, have been accepted by all his successors. The three

**History:**  
**Niebuhr.**



volumes of his History were first published in 1811–32. In 1816, on his way to Rome, he discovered the palimpsest of Gaius in the Capitular Library at Verona. In Rome he found, in the Vatican, certain fragments of Cicero's Speeches *pro M. Fonteio* and *pro C. Rabirio*. In 1823 he settled down for the rest of his life as a Professor at Bonn. Many of the lectures that he there delivered were published, the best known being those on Roman History printed after his death (1847–51).

The textual criticism of Latin authors, as well as the study of Latin Inscriptions, Roman Antiquities and Roman History, formed the wide field of learning traversed by Theodor Mommsen Mommsen. (1817—1903), who was Professor of Ancient History in the University of Berlin and a Member of the Academy for the last forty-five years of his long life. He did much for the text of Livy, and made important contributions to the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, besides writing a valuable paper on the life of the younger Pliny<sup>1</sup>. In the province of historical and antiquarian research, he began by making his mark in the study of Roman Law (1843). Next in order came his 'Oscan Studies' (1845–6), and his 'Dialects of Lower Italy' (1850). In his 'Inscriptions of the Kingdom of Naples' (1852) he applied the results of epigraphical research to the law and the constitutional history of the Italian communities. His treatise on the Roman coinage became, in its final form, an authoritative history of that subject. The three volumes of his widely celebrated 'Roman History' (1854–6) ended, at first, with the battle of Thapsus, but the theme was afterwards taken up at a later point in the masterly survey of the 'Rule of the Provinces from Caesar to Diocletian'. His other works included the historical papers collected in his 'Roman researches', and the great series of volumes on 'Roman Public Law'. In 1847 the definitive scheme for the preparation of a *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* was laid before the Berlin Academy by Mommsen, to whom its execution was entrusted with a perfect confidence that his great powers of work and his remarkable capacity for organisation would ensure its complete success. Of the nominally 'fifteen' volumes, as many as four were edited by Mommsen himself (see Bibliography on p. 763 *supra*).

Among Mommsen's eminent associates in this work was Emil Hübner (1834—1901), who edited the inscriptions of Spain and Britain, and produced, in his *Exempla Scripturae Epigraphicae Latinae*, an important collection of more than 1200 facsimiles of inscriptions of the imperial age preceded by a series of chapters forming an admirable introduction to the study of Roman Epigraphy (1885). It is the imperial counterpart to Ritschl's *Monumenta* of the early Latin of the Republic. His other works included comprehensive bibliographies of Latin Grammar, and of the History of Roman Literature and of Classical Philology. Hübner.

<sup>1</sup> *Hermes*, 1869, p. 31 ; reprinted in *Hist. Schriften*, i (1905), 366—468.

**1285.** Among Latin lexicographers in Germany a place of honour is due to Georges (1806—1895), whose work, confessedly founded on that of Gesner, Forcellini, and Scheller, as well as on his own extensive collections, was warmly eulogised by Wölfflin, the organiser of the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, the publication of which began in 1900 under the united auspices of the five German Academies of Berlin, Göttingen, Leipzig, Munich, and Vienna.

**1286.** The Latin Philology of the Middle Ages was the title of the Professorship held at Munich by Ludwig Traube (1861—1907), who was deservedly celebrated for his profound knowledge of mediaeval palaeography and for his familiarity with the history of the fortunes of the Latin Classics in the Middle Ages. Traube, as a Latin palaeographer, and Lachmann, as a textual critic, are among the glories of the German period of classical scholarship. It is a period specially distinguished by the successful cultivation of the new fields of classical archaeology and comparative philology, and by the academic, and even inter-academic, organisation of vast schemes of co-operative erudition.

**1287.** Mommsen, in the early years of his epigraphical studies in Italy, won for the *Corpus Inscriptionum* the friendly aid of the great epigraphist, Bartolommeo Borghesi (1781—1860), who had published in 1818—20 his two volumes on the new fragments of the *Fasti Consulares*, and whose archaeological correspondence extended from his home on the rock of San Marino to every part of the Italian peninsula. The early collections of Roman inscriptions were published by the explorer of the Catacombs, G. B. De Rossi (1822—1894), who also took part in preparing the inscriptions of Rome in the sixth volume of the *Corpus*.

Passing from Latin inscriptions to Latin authors, we may mention that as Librarian in Milan (1811—9) Angelo Mai (1782—1854) edited from mss formerly at Bobbio (§ 1248), a number of fragments from six Speeches of Cicero, with part of the *Vidularia* of Plautus, and the *scholia* and illustrations in the Ambrosian ms of Terence. After his call to the Vatican Library in 1819, he published a palimpsest containing large portions of Cicero, *De Republica* (1822). The great lexicon of Forcellini (§ 1277) was edited anew by De-Vit in 1857—79 and by Corradini in 1864—90.

**1288.** Latin lexicography was represented in France by the *Thesaurus Poëticus*, the Latin-French and French-Latin Dictionaries, the Dictionary of Latin Proper Names, and the *Addenda Lexicis Latinis* published by L. M. Quicherat (1799—1884). Among the leading Latin scholars was L. E. Benoist (1831—1887), the editor of Lucretius and Virgil, who, in an edition of Livy xxi—xxv, was associated with O. Riemann (1853—1891), the author of admirable treatises on the language and grammar of Livy, and on Latin Syntax. During the last century French

scholarship has owed much to the inspiring influence of classical archaeology. A genuine interest in Roman archaeology, combined with a sympathetic insight into Latin literature, was a leading characteristic of the accomplished Academician Gaston Boissier (1823—1908), the author of admirable works on ‘Cicero and his friends’, on Rome and Pompeii, on Horace and Virgil, on Tacitus and Martial, on Roman Africa, on the Opposition under the Caesars, on Roman religion from Augustus to the Antonines, and on the downfall of Paganism.

Boissier.

1289. In Holland, the most prominent Latinist in the first half of the nineteenth century was Peerlkamp (1781—1865), the hypercritical editor of Horace, who (in Orelli’s phrase) *Horatium ex Horatio ipso expulit*. We may also mention Bake (1787—1864), the discriminating critic of Cicero’s style, and Boot (1811—1901), the editor of Cicero’s *Letters to Atticus*.

Holland :  
Peerlkamp.  
Bake.  
Boot.

1290. In Belgium, the political institutions of Rome were the principal theme of the life-long labours of Pierre Willems (1846—1898), author of *Le droit public romain* (last ed. 1888), and *Le Sénat de la république romaine* (1878—85).

Belgium :  
Willems.

1291. In Denmark, the foremost representative of Latin scholarship was J. N. Madvig (1804—1886), Professor of Latin at Copenhagen from 1829 to 1879, the able editor of Cicero, *De Finibus* (1839; ed. 3, 1876), and of Livy (1861—6), and the author of a *Latin Grammar*, which was translated into all the languages of Europe. The scholar associated with Madvig in his edition of Livy was J. L. Ussing (1820—1905), whose masterpiece was an annotated edition of Plautus (1875—87).

Denmark :  
Madvig.

Ussing.

1292. In England Latin scholarship has been represented by Thomas Hewitt Key (1799—1875), successively Professor of Latin, and of Comparative Grammar, at University College, London. His *Latin Grammar* was completed in 1846, and his unfinished *Latin Dictionary* published at Cambridge in 1888. The best-known works of Benjamin Hall Kennedy (1804—1889), for thirty years head-master of Shrewsbury, are his ‘*Latin Primer*’ and his ‘*Public School Latin Grammar*.’ His school-edition of Virgil was followed by a critical edition of the text. A masterly edition of Lucretius was produced in 1864 by Hugh Andrew Johnstone Munro (1819—1885), who also published a text of Horace, with illustrations by C. W. King (1865), besides an edition of the *Aetna*, ‘*Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus*’, and emendations of Lucilius (in the *Journal of Philology*, 1877—9). In his Latin verse he displayed ‘a masculine vigour’ that was all his own. He was the first Professor of Latin at Cambridge; he held that professorship for three years only (1869—72), but in those few years he gave the first impulse to a reform in the English pronunciation of Latin, which has since been

England :  
Key.

B.H. Kennedy.

Munro.

resumed, and successfully carried out. A more immediate result was attained by George Martin Lane (1823—1897), Professor of Latin at Harvard, whose pamphlet of 1871 soon led to the reform of Latin pronunciation throughout the United States. The first Professor of Latin

at Oxford was John Conington (1825—1869), widely known as the accomplished editor of Virgil (1863—71) and of Persius (1872), and as the translator of both, as well as of the whole of Horace. As Conington's successor, Henry Nettleship

(1839—1893) edited his predecessor's Persius, and completed his commentary on the *Aeneid*. In 1889 he published his *Contributions to Latin Lexicography*. He was specially familiar with the ancient Latin Grammarians, and many of his best papers on them, and on other subjects, were collected in the two volumes of his *Essays* (1885—95).

Horace was edited by A. J. Maclean (1853) and E. C. Wickham (1834—1910), and Juvenal by the former, and by J. E. B. Mayor (1825—1910).

Virgil was the theme of one of the *Classical Essays* (1897) of F. W. H. Myers (1843—1901). In Ireland, the *Aeneid* attracted the learned labours

of the Dublin physician, James Henry (1796—1876), while the *Satires* of Horace and the *Heroïdes* of Ovid were ably edited by Professor Arthur Palmer (1841—1897). In Scotland, William Ramsay of Glasgow (1806—1865) edited Cicero *pro Cluentio* and the *Mostellaria* of Plautus, and produced an excellent 'Manual of Roman Antiquities' (1851); and

William Young Sellar (1825—1891), professor in St Andrew's and Edinburgh, published masterpieces of literary criticism in his 'Roman Poets of the Republic', and in his works on 'Virgil' and on 'Horace and the Elegiac Poets'. Returning to England, we note the name of A. S. Wilkins (1843—1905), the editor of Cicero *De Oratore*, and of Horace's *Epistles*, whose latest work was a sketch of *Roman Education*.

1923. Among English writers on the History or Archaeology of Rome may be mentioned Thomas Arnold (1795—1842), who left behind him a splendid fragment of a 'History of Rome' ending with the close of the Second Punic War; George Long (1800—1879), who produced a 'History of the Decline of the Roman Republic'; Charles Merivale (1808—1894), the historian of the 'Romans under the Empire'; J. H. Parker (1806—1884), Robert Burn (1829—1904), and J. H. Middleton (1846—1896), the authors of well-known works on ancient Rome; and, lastly, Henry Pelham (1846—1907), whose small volume of 'Outlines of Roman History' has been described as 'the most able sketch of the subject that has yet been published'. He took a prominent part in the foundation of the 'British School at Rome' in 1901; and on the 3rd of June, 1910, the efforts of leading members of that School were



crowned with success by the inauguration of a new Society for the Promotion of Roman (or Latin) Studies.

In this brief review of some of the leading representatives of Latin Scholarship (as in the corresponding review of Greek Scholarship in the *Companion to Greek Studies*), many notable names and many important facts have necessarily been omitted. Further information may, however, be found in the works mentioned below.

General bibliography in Hübner's *Bibliographie der klassischen Alterthums-wissenschaft*, ed. 2, pp. 1—139, 1889. Bibliographies of the special literature of the several parts of the subject in J. E. Sandys' *History of Classical Scholarship* (with chronological tables, and with 86 illustrations) in three volumes, (i), from the Sixth Century B.C. to the end of the Middle Ages, 2nd ed., 702 pp., 1906; (ii and iii), from the Revival of Learning to the end of the Nineteenth Century, 1021 pp., 1908. Outlines (with bibliographies and 'loci classici') in A. Gudeman, *Grundriss zur Geschichte der klassischen Philologie*, 2nd ed., 260 pp., 1909; short sketch in W. Kroll's *Geschichte der klass. Philologie*, 152 pp. 16mo, 1908; and 'Ueberblick' in Otto Immisch, *Wie studirt man klass. Philologie?*, pp. 18—118, 1909. 'Bibliographical Index' on pp. 461—476 of H. T. Peck's *History of Classical Philology*, 1911.

Among books dealing with definite portions of the subject, or with individual scholars, may be mentioned :—Comparetti, *Virgilio nel medio evo* (E. T. 1895); De Nolhac, *Pétrarque et l'humanisme*, ed. 2, 1907; Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des klassischen Alterthums*, ed. 3, 1893; Geiger, *Renaissance und Humanismus in Italien und Deutschland*, 1881—3; J. A. Symonds, *Revival of Learning*, 1877 etc; J. E. Sandys, *Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning*, 1905; Bursian, *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie in Deutschland*, 1883; L. Müller, *D<sup>o</sup> in den Niederlanden*, 1869; Christie, *Étienne Dolet*, ed. 2, 1899; Bernays, *Sealiger*, 1855; Pattison, *Casaubon*, ed. 2, 1892; Jebb, *Erasmus*, 1890, and *Bentley*, 1882; and Ribbeck, *Ritschl*, 1879—81. Bibliography of *Bentley* by A. T. Bartholomew and J. W. Clark, 1908; and of *Mommsen* by Zangemeister and Jacobs, 1905.



# I. INDEX OF PERSONS, DEITIES AND RACES<sup>1</sup>.

*The numbers refer to the sections.*

- Accius, L. 1091, 1239  
 Acro 1243  
 Aelius Stilo, L. 1214, 1239  
 Aemilius Lepidus 802  
 — Paulus, L. (1) consul  
 216 B.C. 735; (2) pro-  
 consul 189 B.C. 1123  
 — Scaurus, M., aedile  
 58 B.C., 800, 872; coin of  
 704  
 Aesculapius 205, 1077  
 Aesöpus, C. 806  
*Aetna*, uncertain author of  
 the 938 f  
 Afranius 912  
 Africans in Latin literature  
 1021-8, 1217  
 Agrippa, M. Vipsanius 767,  
 1071  
 Agrippina the elder 242;  
*carpentum* of 252  
 Alexander Polyhistor 1240  
 Ambrose, St 1033; 1032  
 Ammianus Marcellinus 1031  
 Annalists, the Roman 101,  
 975  
 Antiochus Epiphanes 815;  
 war with 759 f  
 Antiochus of Ascalon 1052  
 'Antonia', busts of 838  
 Antoninus Pius 246, 462,  
 774, 817; sculpture under  
 839; temple of A. and  
 Faustina 822, 830  
 Antönius, M. 765, 969  
 Apollo 205, 212; A. Mëdī-  
 cus 1074  
 Apollodōrus of Damascus  
 815, 817  
 Appius Claudius, censor 43,  
 112, 960  
 Apüleius 1023  
 Apüli 39  
 Arcadius, the Column of 846  
 Arcësilas 1052  
 Arnöbicus 1027  
 Arria, wife of Paetus 234  
 Articuleius (aedile) 1110  
 Asclëpiädës 1079 f, 1087  
 Ascönius 980  
 Ateius Praetextatus, L. 1240  
 Atticus, Pomponius 856,  
 1240  
*Augustae, Scriptores historiae*  
 1019  
 'Augustan' poetry 920  
 Augustine, St 1034  
 Augustus 45, 211 f, 231,  
 380 ff, 519, 521, 728, 771 f,  
 779, 802 f, 856, 864, 970;  
*denarius* of 704; temple  
 of Augustus and Liüia  
 829; portraits of 838, 871  
 Aurelian 51, 798  
 Aurëlius, M. 51, 774, 823,  
 872, 1067; Arch of 831;  
 sculpture under 839;  
 bronze bust of 841; panel  
 from an Arch of 844;  
 column of 844  
 Aurelius Verus, L. 774  
 Aurunci 1, 9  
 Ausönes 1  
 Ausönius 955  
 Babrius, Latin translation of  
 fables of 1141  
 Benedict, St 1046  
 Boëthius 1042 f, 1125, 1252  
 Bruttii 15  
 Brutus, (1) M. and D. 784;  
 (2) M. 766; bust of 'Bru-  
 tus' 838, 841  
 Caecilia Metella, epitaph of  
 1094 (p. 737)  
 Caecina, A. 219  
 Caesar, C. Iulius 974; 3,  
 44, 115, 118 ff, 291, 379 f,  
 718, 721, 731, 733 f, 740 f,  
 743, 779, 796 f, 802, 831,  
 834, 872, 1072, 1087, 1275;  
*denarius* of 704; Lauren-  
 tian MS of 1150; con-  
 tinuations of wars of 1217  
 Caligula 46  
 Calpurnia, wife of Pliny 234  
 Calpurnius 937  
 Campani 1, 10, 1206  
 Cangi 1117  
 Caracalla 51, 394, 699, 727;  
 Arch of 831; sculpture  
 under 839; relief of 845  
 Carmenta 1074  
 Carna 1074  
 Carnëades 1052  
 Cassiodōrus 15, 1044, 1246  
 Cassius, (1) Spurius Cassius  
 Viscellinus 835; (2) C.  
 Cassius Longinus 766  
 Castor, temple of 822, 829  
 Cato, the elder 961; 127,  
 134, 254, 272, 538, 796,  
 823, 959, 1076  
 Catullus 917 f; 226, 1228,  
 1230 f, 1233 ad fin., 1234;  
*Carm.* iv 1181

<sup>1</sup> The indexes contain no references to the Chronological Tables.

For Scholars and Modern Writers, see Index III.

- Cātulus, Q. Lutatius 757, 804  
 Celsus 989, 1081  
 Celts 26; *Keltai* 21, 32  
 Censorinus 102, 111, 1016  
 Ceres 205; temple of 814, 853  
 Chaldaeans 1072  
 Chārius 1242 f  
 'Chronographer of 354 A.D., the' 136, 139  
 Chrysippus 1057, 1060, 1083  
 Cicero 964 f; 111, 345, 856, 1048, 1072, 1244, 1252, 1256, 1258 f, 1280 f; speeches 965-9; *clausulae* 970; rhetorical works 971; philosophical works 972; letters 973; criticised by Fronto 1021; Cicero and philosophy 1051 ff; Cicero and the New Academy 1052; *Academica* 972, 1054; *De Natura Deorum* 972, 1054, 1064; *De Finibus* 972, 1055, 1065; bust 1108; *De Oratore* 971; Harleian MS of 1160; palimpsest of *De Rep.* 1146; Cicero and Lucretius 1215  
 Cicero's influence on Quintilian 998; Tacitus (in the *Dialogus*) 1002; Pliny the younger 1009; Minucius Felix 1024; Cyprian 1026; Arnobius 1027; Lactantius 1028; Jerome 1029; Ammianus Marcellinus 1031; Symmachus 1032; Ambrose 1033; Augustine 1034; Macrobius 1035; Sulpicius Seuerus 1039; Saluianus 1040; Italian humanists, etc. 972  
 Claudian 957, 1180  
 Claudii, the 306  
 Claudius 8, 46, 231, 730, 1092, 1095, 1108, 1117; *oratio* of 1124  
 Claudius, (1) Appius Cl. censor 43, 112, 960; (2) C. Cl. Pulcher 804, 807; (3) Cl. Quadrigarius 975, 979  
 Coelius Antipater 975  
 Columella 936, 990; 81, 254  
 Commodus 728, 795; sculpture under, and bust of 839  
 Concord, temple of 822  
 Constantine 51, 799; Arch of 831, 843, 846; sculpture under 840  
 Constantinus Africanus 1084  
 Cornelia, (1) mother of the Gracchi 230; (2) wife of Pompeius Magnus 230  
 Cossutius, Roman architect 815  
 Crates of Mallos 274, 1239  
 Croesus, coin of 701  
 Cūnina 203  
 Cupra 217  
 Curtius 987  
 Cyprian, St 1026  
*Dea Mēfitis, Angērōna* and *Scabies* 1075  
 'Deus Rēdicūlus,' temple of 857  
 Diana Nemorensis 215  
 Diocletian 51, 291; edict of 1124; 648  
 Diodōrus Siculus, chronology of 101, 137  
 Diōmēdēs, Grammarian 1243  
 Dionysius Thrax 1239  
 Dioscōrides, (1) Greek botanist 1086; (2) gem-engraver 864, 866  
 Domitian 49, 743, 794, 797  
 Donatus 1186, 1243, 1247  
 Druids, the 1069  
 'Duenos' inscr. 1093, 1212  
 Dūilius 823, 1108, 1130, 1212  
 Elāgābālus 244, 247  
 Ennius 903; 13, 274, 1091, 1224, 1236  
 Epictētus 1067  
 Epīcūrus 1049 f  
 Eteocretans 1199 f  
 Etruscans 217 ff, 1070, 1204  
 Eutrōpius 1030  
 Fabianus, Pāpīrius p. 710 n.  
 Fabii, the 306  
 Fabius, (1) Q. Fabius Maximus 1108, Allobrogicus 843; (2) F. Pictor 134, 979  
 Faliscan (language) 1208  
 Fannia, wife of Heluidius Priscus 234  
 Faustina, wife of M. Aurelius 242  
 Febris 1075  
 Festus 1216, 1241, 1266  
 Firmicus Maternus, Iulius 1072  
 Flaminius, Gaius 338, 779  
 Flavius, Cn. 112, 125  
 Florus 1017  
 Fortuna Primigenia 214; F. Virilis, temple of 821, 827  
 Frontinus 1000, 1259  
 Fronto 1021  
 Fulvius Nobilior, (1) M. 796, 798; (2) his son Q. 788  
 Furius Camillus, M., the dictator 782  
 Gabii, treaty with 1091  
 Gaius 694, 1020, 1284; MS of 1147  
 Galātae 21; cp. 1202  
 Galba 729  
 Galen 1076, 1082; editions and MSS of 1085  
 Gālērius, Arch of, 846  
 Galli, language of the 1202  
 Galli Sēnōnes 4  
 Gallienus, sculpture under 839  
 Gallus, C. Sulpicius 134  
 Gārāmantēs 647  
 Gauls 1202  
 Gellius 1022; 102, 1242  
 Germani 21  
 Germānicus, Caesar 1072  
 Good Shepherd, statuettes of the 848  
 Gordian III 798  
 Gracchus, Gaius 341 ff, 462; Tiberius 338 ff, 361, 835  
 Greeks in Italy 1203  
 Hadrian 51, 231, 247, 291, 721, 741 f, 775, 815, 817, 872; sculpture under 839; bust of 839; panels of age of 844  
 Hannibal p. 3, n 1; §§ 3, 5, 735  
 Heluētii 731, 734  
 Hercules 205; temple at Cora 826  
*Heremium, auctor ad* 962  
 Hermes Moscōphōrus 848  
 Hērnici 9  
 Hilary of Poitiers, St 1038  
 Hippocrates 1083  
 Hippolytus, statue of St 848  
 Hirpini 39  
 Hirtiū 974  
 Horace 924 f; 6, 8, 12, 231, 1229-33, 1243, 1275, 1281 f,



- 1289; Brit. Mus. MS of 1167; *Carmen Saeculare* 1129  
 Hortensius, bust of 1108  
 Hyginus, (1) C. Iulius, grammarian 1240; (2) *Grōmaticus*, 737, 1089; (3) astronomical poet 1072  
 Ianus 200, 203; Arch of 206, 831  
 Iapygians 37, 1199  
 Illyrians 1200  
 Insūbres 3  
 Isis, temples and worship of 232  
 Isterdūca 203  
 Iulia, (1) Caesar's daughter 230, 242; (2) Mamaea 242; (3) Alpinula, forged epitaph of 1135  
 Iulianus, Arch assigned to 831  
 Iuno 203, 218; Curitis 213; Sospita of Lanuvium 862  
 Iupiter 199, 203, 205, 216; temple of 822; Capitoline, statue of 835, 851 f  
 Jerome, St 1029; 1243 f  
 Julian II, gold *soldus* of 700  
 Justin 982  
 Justinian 1046  
 Juvenal 951 f; 231, 1107, 1265  
 Keltoi 21, 32; Celts 26j  
 Lacedaemonians 13  
 Lactantius 1028  
 Lar 200; Lāres Compitales 45  
 Lātini 1, 9; L. Iuniani 415  
 Leo I, gold *tremissis* of 700  
 Licinianus, Granius 1018  
 Licinius (1) P. Licinius Varus 786; (2) C. Licinius Macer 131  
 Ligurians 27, 29, 33, 1201  
 Liuiā, wife of Augustus 228  
 Liuius Andrōnīcus 274, 783, 800, 807, 903, 979  
 Livy 979 f; 1244, 1269, 1274, 1276; chronology of 101; recension of 1032; Vienna MS 1146; Epitome of 1143  
 Lucan 933 f  
 Lūcani 39  
 Lūcēres 35, 308, 310  
 Lūcilius (1) 913; 9; (2) L. Bassus, Sextus 773  
 Lūcina 1074  
 Lucretius 915 f; 1265, 1282, 1292; L. and Epicureanism 1048 ff  
 Lucullus, M. and L. Licinius 807  
 Ludius (?) 877, 885  
 'Lygdamus' 925  
 Macrōbius 1035; 102, 1245  
 Maecēnas, signet of 864  
 Magna Mater of the Phrygians, the 205  
 Mānilius 928; 1072, 1266  
 Manlius, C. 329, 784  
 Marcellus, M. Claudius, (1) conqueror of Syracuse 16; (2) nephew of Augustus 872; theatre of 820  
 Marcellus Empiricus 1076, 1086  
 'Marcius uates' 959  
 Mārius, C. 717, 721, 731 ff, 741  
 Marrucini 8  
 Mars 203, 212, 216, 1074  
 Marsi 8  
 Martial 949 f; 300  
 Martianus Capella 219, 1037, 1246  
 Mater Mātūta, temple of 818, 829  
 Maxentius 51  
 Mēla, Pompōnius 988  
 Menerūa 217  
 Mercurius 205  
 Messapians 1199  
 Metellus 733  
 Minucius Felix 1024  
 Misenates 775  
 Mithridātes the Great, wars against 759; gems of 872 (spelt Mithradates on his coins)  
 Mummīus, L. 800, 1107  
 Naenius, Cn. 800, 1216, 1218  
 Namatianus, Rutilius 958; 17  
 Nēmēsiānus 954  
 Nēpos, Cornelius 976, 1259  
 Neptunus 205  
 Nero 46, 760, 797 f  
 Nerua 49  
 Nicōmāchi 1244  
 Nigidiū Fīgūlus 1240  
 Numa, calendar of 220  
 Octauia, sister of Augustus 230  
 Octavianus 380, 728, 767 ff.  
 See also *Augustus*  
 Orata, Sergius 833  
 Orosius 1030  
 Oscans, language of the 1206  
 Ovid 927; 8, 111, 1224, 1226; *Fasti* of 102  
 Paeligni 8  
 Pāles 207  
 Palladius 254  
 Panaetius 1062; 1047  
 Paulus Diacōnus 1216, 1241, 1251  
 Pelasgi 22 f, 29, 37  
 Pēnātes 200, 203  
 Perseus and Andrōmēda, relief of 847  
 Persius 932; 1266  
*Peruigilium Veneris*, unknown author of 953  
 Peter, statue of St 848  
 Petronius 996; *cena Trimalchionis* of 244, 253, 264, 799  
 Phaedrus 829; 1265  
 Philippus Arabs, bust of 839  
 Philo of Larissa 1052  
 Philōcālus, Calendar of 780  
 Picentes 7  
 Pindar and Horace 1236  
 Plautus 905-9; 1214, 1239, 1259, 1269, 1282; metres of 1220, 1222 f; abl. in *d* 1123  
 Pliny the elder 997; 102, 773; the *Naturalis Historia* of 1068 f, 1076; Leiden MS 1157  
 Pliny the younger 1009 f; 234 f, 253, 261, 291, 1259; imitated by Symmachus 1030, and Sidorius Apollinaris 1041  
 Pollio, Asinius 978, 983  
 Polybius 737; chronology of 101; Livy and 979  
 Pompeius Magnus, Cn. 3, 733, 741, 765 f, 801, 864; plan of theatre of 800; (2) Sextus 766 ff.  
 Porphyrio 1243  
 Poseidōnius of Apāmēa 1063  
 Postūmius Tubertus, A. 782, 814  
 Priscian 1045, 1246  
 Prōbus, Vālērius 1242

- Propertius 926; Naples MS of 1175; Wolfenbüttel MS of 1176; (iii 8, 37 and iv 5, 47 f) 1184  
 Prudentius 956; MS of 1145  
 Publius Philo 334 f  
 Publius Syrus 1275  
 Pupienus, portraits of 839  
 Pyrgotēles 864  
  
 Quintilian 998 f; 1242, 1260  
 Quirinus, census of 1135  
  
 Raeti 25, 28  
 Ramnenses 30, 35; Ramnes 308, 310  
 Rasena 217  
 Rauennates 775  
 Remmius Palaemon, Q. 283, 1242  
 Romulus 104 f  
 Roscius, Q. 806 f, 966  
 Roscius, Sextus 966  
 Rutilius Namatianus 958; 17; R. Rufus, P. 717, 784  
  
 Sabina, wife of Hadrian 242  
 Sabini 6, 30  
 Sālii, the 203  
 Sallust 997; 6: Brit. Mus. MS of 1168  
 Saluianus 1040  
 Saluius Iulianus, edict of 357  
 Sālus 1074  
 Saturn, temple of 827  
 Saturninus 341, 345 f  
 Scipio (1) Barbatus 862, 1212; (2) Africanus maior 733; (3) minor 241; (4) S. Nāsica 245, 800  
 Scipios, epitaphs of the 1094  
 Scribonius Curio, C. 834;  
 Scribonius Largus 1086  
 Seneca, (1) the rhetorician 983; (2) his son, the tragic poet 930, and philosopher 991 f, 1067  
 Seruius 1030, 1186, 1245  
 Seruius Tullius 312  
 Sēuērus (1) Alexander 247; (2) Septimius 51, 728; sculpture under 838; bronze statue of 841; reliefs of the Arch of 845  
 Sextius Niger (1) Q., philosopher p. 710 n., (2) medical writer 1086  
 Sicāni 23 f  
 Sicels, Siculi 23 f, 29, 37, 1211  
 Sīdōnius Apollināris 1041  
 Silius Italicus 947 f, 1180  
 Siluanus 200  
 Sisenna 975  
 Sōlinus, Iulius 102  
 Sōranus 1080, 1086  
 Sōsīgēnēs 1072  
 Sōsus, Pergamene artist 897  
 Sōtīōn p. 710 n.  
 Spaniards distinguished in Latin literature 1217  
 Spurius Caruilius 273, 1091  
 Statilius Taurus, amphitheatre of 834  
 Statius 942 f; 1260, 1275 n.; *Siluae*, MS of 1179  
 Suetonius 1013 f; 1242, 1249; MS of 1164  
 Sulla 348 ff, 363; signet of 864; reputed bust of 837  
 Sulpicia 925  
 Sulpicius (1) C. Sulp. Galus 1072; (2) S. Rufus 347 f; (3) S. Sēuērus 1039  
 Symmachus 1032, 1244; 225  
  
 Tacitus 1001 f; 231, 1216, 1259, 1267, 1281  
 Tarquinius Priscus 779, 783, 851 f  
 Taurini 3  
 Terence 910 f; 1214, 1243, 1252, 1275, 1282; metres of 1221  
 Terentianus Maurus 1243  
 Tertullian 1025  
 'Theodosius,' statue of 841; obelisk of 846  
 Tībērius 46, 728, 730; sword of 1113  
 Tibullus 925; 1253; the 'Cuiacian Fragment' 1179  
 Timaeus 134  
 Titienses 30, 35; Tities 308, 310  
 Titus 49, 797; Arch of 822, 831, 843; bronze bust of 841  
  
 Trajan 50, 291, 299, 796, 815, 823, 1010, 1012, 1083; sculpture under 839; reliefs from T.'s forum 843 f; T.'s Column 843; *tabulae alimentariae* 1124  
 Trogus, Pompeius 981  
 Turiae, laudatio 230 n.  
 Tyrannion 1240  
 Tyrsēni 25  
  
 Umbrians 23; language of the 1206  
  
 Vālērius (1) V. Antias 275, 979; (2) V. Flaccus 940 f; (3) V. Maximus 286; (4) V. Prōcūlus 532  
 Varro 963; 6, 102, 135, 211, 300, 1047, 1081, 1239; *de re rustica* of 254  
 Vēgētius 741  
 Velleius Patercūlus 985  
 Vēnēti 3  
 Venus and Roma, temple of 817  
 Venus Libitina 227  
 Verginius Rufus 452  
 Verrius Flaccus 282, 1216, 1241  
 Vertumnus 217  
 Vespasian 48, 291, 728; *sestertius* of 703; 730; temple of 830; portrait bust of 838  
 Vesta 200, 203, 212; temple of, in Rome 53; at Tibur 829  
 Vestal Virgins 202, 207, 233  
 Vestini 8  
 Victor, Aurelius 1030  
 Virgil 921 f; 14, 254, 1146, 1216, 1224 f, 1244; studied by Lucan 933; Columella 936; Silius 947; Ausonius 955; Prudentius 956; Claudian 957; MSS 1144 f  
 Virgilius Maro, the grammarian 1247  
 Vitruvius 984; 813  
 Volscians 9, 1211  
  
 Zēno 1058 ff

## II. INDEX OF PLACES, RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS.

- Achaea, province 590  
 Achradīna 16  
 Ācis, fl. 16  
 Addua, fl. 3  
 Aegātēs, insulae 16  
 Aenāria, insula 10  
 Aetna, mons 16  
 Africa, province 591, 647  
 Agrigentum 16, 740  
 Alba Longa 9; Alban lake  
     9; Alban mount 9, 252  
 Albūla, fl. 9  
 Ālētrium 1109; inscr. 1091  
 Alexandria 777  
 Allia, fl. 9, 114  
 Alpine passes 3; provinces  
     592  
 Amīternum 6  
 Ānāpus, fl. 16  
 Ancōna 1, 7  
 Ancŷra, see *Ancyranum*,  
     *monumentum*, Index IV  
 Angītia, nemus 8  
 Ānio, fl. 9; A. Vetus 43;  
     Nouus 46, 1109  
 Anxur 9  
 Apennines 1, 6  
 Apulia 12, 39, 525  
 Aquae Sextiae 656; A. Sulis  
     657  
 Aquileia 3, 344  
 Aquinum 9  
 Arabia, province 593, 646  
 Ārār, fl. 656  
 Ārēlātē 637, 656  
 Argentarius, mons 5  
 Aricia 214  
 Ariminum 4  
 Armēnia maior, province  
     594  
 Arnus, fl. 5  
 Arrētium 5  
 Ascūlum 12; A. Picēnum 7  
 Asia, province 595, 642  
 Assinarus, fl. 16  
 Assyria, province 596  
 Āthēsīs, fl. 3  
 Auāricum 656  
 Auens, fl. 6  
 Auernus, lacus 10  
 Aufidus, fl. 12  
 Augusta Taurinorum 656;  
     Praetoria 656; Trēuēro-  
     rum 656  
 Aulōn 640; vale of 13  
 Ausōnia 1  
 Baiae 10, 252  
 Bandūsīnus, fons 12  
 Bantia 14, 1120, 1206  
 Bēnācus, lacus 3  
 Beneuentum 11, 1203; Arch  
     at 843  
 Bibractē 731, 734  
 Bithŷnia and Pontus, pro-  
     vince 597  
 Bobbio 1248, 1287  
 Bonna 772  
 Bōnōnia 656  
 Britain, province 598, 657;  
     chief exports 638; Roman  
     walls in 739, 746  
 Brundisium 13, 525  
 Burdigāla 637, 656  
 Caerē 5, 546, 809  
 Caesaraugusta 655  
 Caesārēa 647  
 Caesārōdūnum 656  
 Cālabria 13  
 Cāmārina 16  
 Campania 10, 36, 39, 524 f  
 Cāmūlōdūnum 657  
 Cannae 12, 735  
 Canōuium 657  
 Cappādōcia, province 599  
 Capreae 10  
 Cāpŷa 9, 36, 634, 835  
 Carnuntum 639  
 Carthage 647; navy of in  
     Punic wars 757 ff; treaty  
     with 1091  
 Cāsīlinum 9  
 Cāsīnum 9  
 Caudīnac, fauces 11  
 Chartres 1253, 1255  
 Charybdis 16  
 Cilīcia, province 600  
 Cirta 661  
 Clānis, fl. 5  
 Clitumnus, fl. 4  
 Clunī 1250, 1258  
 Clūsium 5  
 Colonia Agrippīna 656  
 Cōmum 3, 253  
 Corfinium 8  
 Corsica 17  
 Corstopitum 657  
 Cortōna 5  
 Corvey 1250, 1259  
 Crēmēra, fl. 9, 114  
 Crēmōna 3  
 Crete and Cyrene, provinces  
     601  
 Crōtōn 15, 38  
 Cūmae 10, 36, 252, 1091  
 Cūmānus, sinus 10  
 Cyprus, province 602, 642  
 Dacia, province 603  
 Dacian tablets p. 767, n. 3  
 Dalmātia, province 609, 640  
 Dicaearchia 10  
 Dīgēntia, fl. 6, 12  
 Dūbis, fl. 656  
 Dubrae 772  
 Dyrrāchium 640, 1203  
 Ēbūrācum 657  
 Egypt 604, 645  
 Ēlēa 14  
 Ēmērīta Augusta 655  
 Ēpipōlae, near Syracuse 16  
 Ēpīrus, province 605  
 Ēpōrēdia 344, 567, 571, 656  
 Ēridānus, fl. 3  
 Eryx, mons 16  
 Etruria 5, 217 ff, 524 f, 633,  
     809 f, 861; painting in  
     875  
 Euryēlus, near Syracuse 16  
 Fabrātēria 344  
 Faesūlae 5, 800  
 Fālērī 5, 213, 809  
 Fiscellus, mons 6  
 Florentia 5  
 Formiae 9  
 Forum Appī 252, 544; F.  
     Iulī 544, 771; F. Sem-  
     pronī 544  
 Fossa Drusi 772  
 Fūcinus, lacus 8

Fulda 1250

Gālātia, province 606; 1202

Gālēsus, fl. 13

Gallen, St 1248, 1258

Gallia Cisalpina 1, 3, 525;

Narbonensis 772; *see*

Gaul

Gargānus, mons 12

Gaul, provinces 607, 656;

chief exports 637

Gēla 16

Germany, provinces 608, 639,

656

Gēsōriācum 637, 772

Glēuum 772

Greece and Italy, 2; trade

with 641

Gurgūres, montes 6

Hadrumētum 647

Hālŷcus, fl. 16

Heirctēs, mons 16

Henna 16

Herculaneum 10, 232, 235,

878, 1083, 1139, 1147

Herculis Portus 5

Hespēria 1

Himēra, fl. 16

Hispālis 655

Iāpŷgia 13

Ibērus, fl. 655

Īguūm 4, 37, 216, 1206

Ilerda 777

Illyricum, province 609, 640

Ilua, insula 5, 633

India, trade with 646

Interamna 4

Isca Silūrum 657

Italia 1, 15, 37

Iuliōbōna 637, 657

Judaea, province 610

Lambaesis 743 f

Langres 1258

Lānuūium 9, 320

Lārius lacus 3

Lātium 1, 9, 29, 524 f, 809

Lāuīnium 9

Lemnos, insc. from 1204

Ligūria 3

Liris, fl. 9

Londinium 657

Lūcānia 14, 39

Lucrētis, mons 6

Lugudūnum (or Lugdūnum)

656; Batāuorum 656

Luguallium 657

Luna 17, 633

Lutudaron 1117

Lŷcia and Pamphŷlia, pro-

vince 611

Mācēdōnia, province 612,

640

Magna Graecia 1, 38; paint-

ing in 874

Maleuentum 11, 1203

Mauretania, province 613

Mēdiōlānum 3, 656; Santō-

num 656

Mesopotāmia, province 614

Messāna 16

Messāpia 13

Mētāpontum 14, 38

Metaurus, fl. 4

Mēuānia 4

Mincius, fl. 3

Misēnum, prom. 10, 772

Moesia, province 615

Moguntiācum 656, 772

Monte Cassino, 1046; MSS

of, 1148, 1259

Nar, fl. 4, 6

Narbo Martius 344, 572

Nēāpolis 10

Nēmausus 656, 825

Nemi, lake of 9

Neptunus, mons 16

Nîmes, 'Maison Carrée' at

830; Pont du Gard, near

825

Noricum, province 616

Oenōtria 1, 15

Olisipo 655

Opicia 1

Orleans 1255

Ortŷgia, part of Syracuse

16

Ostia 567, 626

Paestum 14, 94 (p. 82),

568

Pālinūrus, prom. 14

Pannonia, province 617, 639

Pannormus 16

Pātāium 3

Patrai 659

Pharsālus, battle of 733

Picēnum 7, 525

Pisae 5

Pisaurum 1094

Placentia 3

Pōla 3

Pompeii 10, 56, 228, 232,

235, 245 f, 251, 263 ff,

738, 800, 835, 878, 887,

1083, 1095 (p. 738), 1139

f; insc. 1122; *graffiti*

1132 (8)

Populonia 5

Pōseidōnia 14, 38

Praeneste 214, 573, 1091,

1094, 1210

Prōchŷta, insula 10

Pūtēōli 10, 634, 812

Raetia, province 618

Rauenna 3, 772

Rēate 6

Rēgium or Rhēgium 15 and

note, 38; insc. on p. 752

Rhēgina, Columna 15

Rome 5, 9, 29, 40 ff; area

521; date of origin 134;

industry and commerce

624 ff, 632, 648; libraries

299; music 799; navy of

754 ff, 762; painting 876 ff,

884 ff, 890; philosophy

1047; population 520 ff;

primitive architecture 808

ff; public games 778 ff;

sculpture 835 ff; sundials

245; theatrical perform-

ances 800 ff; town life 246

ff; *Ara Pacis Augustae*

843, 849; *Basilica Porcia*

823; *Campūs Martius* 44

f, 50 f; *Circus Maximus*

43, 46; *C. Flaminius* 786;

*cloāca maxima* 41 f; *Colos-*

*seum* 820, 825, 834; *Curia*

309, 554 f; *C. Pompeii*

801; *Curtius, lacus* 53;

*emporium* 42, 625 f; *For-*

*nix Fabianus* 843; *Forum*

*Boarium* 42, 624, 628,

781, 794 f; *F. Holitorium*

42, or *Olitorium* 628, 802;

*F. Transitorium* 49; *F.*

*Romanum* 53, 781, 794

(insc. 1002); *Lūpocal*

206; *mons Auentinus* etc.

42; *m. Caelius* 41; *Pālā-*

*tinus* 40, 54; Pantheon,

the 829; *pons Muluius* 42;

*p. Sublŷcius* 42, 624; *portic-*

*us Octaviae* 299, 802;

*p. Pompeii* 801; *Roma*

*Quadrata* 40, 42; *Septi-*

*montium* 41; *murus Ser-*

*uius* 42; *Sūbūra* 41, 1209;

*Tābulārium* 820; temple

of Castor 822, 829, Con-

cord 822, Saturn 827,



- Venus and Roma 817,  
Vesta 53, 206; *Theatrum  
Pompeii* (Magni) 801; *T.  
Marcelli* 802 f; *T. Corn.  
Balbi* 803; *Thermae* 247,  
of Agrippa 45, 829, Cara-  
calla and Diocletian 833;  
*Tullianum* 809 f; *Vicus  
sandaliarius* 630, *V. Tuscus*  
1209; *Via Sacra* 53; Villa  
of Liuia, paintings in the  
890  
Rûbicon, fl. 3  
Rûdiæ 13  
Sâbâtinus, lacus 5  
Sacer, mons 9  
Sâlernum 10, 252  
Sâlônæ 640  
Samnium 11; imperial pas-  
tures in 1124  
Sardinia 17; S. and Corsica,  
province of 619  
Scylâcêum 15  
Scylla 16  
Sêgesta 16  
Sêlinus 16  
Sena Gallica 4  
Sêuêrus, mons 6  
Sicily 16, province 620  
Sirmio 3  
Soracte 4  
Spain, province 621, 655;  
chief exports 636  
Stâbiæ 10  
Suessa Aurunca 9  
Surrentum 10  
Sÿbâris 14 f, 38  
Sÿmaethus, fl. 16  
Syracuse 16  
Syria, province 622, 643  
Târentum 13, 252  
Tarquinii 5  
Tarrâcina 9  
Tergestê 3  
Tetrica rupes 6  
Thamugadi (p. 374 n.), 1095  
(fig. 119)  
Thêuestê 661  
Thrace, province 623, 640  
Thûlê 772  
Tîbêris, fl. 4 f, 247  
Tibur 9  
Ticinus, fl. 3  
Tîfâta, mons 11  
Titerum Tîbêrinum 4  
Tours 1250  
Trâsimênus, lacus 5, 1089  
Trêbia, fl. 3  
Trêrus, fl. 9  
Tuscûlum 9, 252, 800, 1094  
Tyrrhênia 1  
Umbria 4; language of, 1206;  
35  
Veii 5  
Vêlia 14, 38, 252  
Vêlinus, lacus 4, 6  
Vênêtia 3  
Vênûsia 12, 525, 568  
Verbannus, lacus 3  
Vêrôna 3  
Vêsiuius 10  
Vipascense metallum 247,  
1121  
Virocônium 657  
Volaterræ 5  
Volsinius, lacus 5  
Volturnus, fl. 10  
Vultur, mons 1, 12  
Zêphÿrium, prom. 15

### III. INDEX OF SCHOLARS AND MODERN WRITERS.

- Adam, Alexander 1275  
 Ælfric of Eynsham 1252  
 Agricola, Rodolphus 1269  
 Alcuin 1159, 1251  
 Aldhelm, St 1250  
 Alexander of Ville-Dieu 1253  
 Alfred the Great 1252  
 Alvarez, Emmanuel 1263  
 Aquaviva, C. 1263  
 Arnold, Thomas 1293  
 Ascham, Roger 1268  
 Aurispa, Joannes 1259
- Bachrens, Emil 1282  
 Bake, Janus 1289  
 Barth, K. von 1179  
 Barzizza, Gasparino da 1264  
 Baxter, William 1273  
 Bede (*Bæda*) 1250; MS of 1157  
 Beloch, J. 524  
 Benoist, L. E. 1288  
 Bentley, Richard 1275 f; 1195  
 Biondo, Flavio 1259  
 Boccaccio, Giovanni 1257  
 Boissier, Gaston 1288  
 Bond, John 1273  
 Boniface, St 1250  
 Boot, J. C. G. 1289  
 Bopp, Franz 1283  
 Borghesi, B. 1287; 1135  
 Bosius, S. 1179  
 Broukhusius, Janus 1272  
 Brugmann, Karl 1283  
 Buchanan, George, 1268  
 Budaëus, G. 1264  
 Bücheler, Franz 1282  
 Burman, Pieter, I and II 1276  
 Burn, Robert 1293  
 Bussi, Giov. Andrea de 1261
- Camerarius, Joachim 1269  
 Casaubon, Isaac 1266  
 Ciriaco d' Ancona 1135  
 Clarke, Samuel 1275  
 Columban, St 1248  
 Conington, John 1292  
 Corradini, Francesco 1287
- Corssen, Wilhelm 1283; 25  
 Cujas, Jacques 1265; 1179  
 Curtius, Georg 1283
- Dennis, George 218  
 De Rossi, G. B. 1287; 1135  
 De-Vit, Vincenzo 1287  
 Dolet, Étienne 1265  
 Drakenborch, Arnold 1276  
 Dryden, John 1273  
 Du Cange, C. du Fresne 1271
- Eberhard of Bethune 1253  
 Erasmus, Desiderius 1262, 1265  
 Ernesti, J. A. 1280
- Fabricius, J. A. 1280  
 Facciolati, Jacopo 1277  
 Farnaby, Thomas 1273  
 Fleckeisen, Alfred 1282  
 Forcellini, Ægidio 1277  
 Francius, Petrus 1272  
 Frazer, J. G. 215  
 Friedländer, Ludwig 1282
- Garlandia, Joannes de 1543  
 Georges, K. E. 1285  
 Gerbert of Aurillac 1252  
 Gesner, J. M. 1280  
 Gibbon, Edward 1275  
 Godefroy, D. and J. 1265  
 Golding, Arthur 1273  
 Graevius, J. G. 1272  
 Gregory, (1) the Great 1247; (2) of Tours 1217, 1247  
 Gronovius, J. F. 1272  
 Grotius, Hugo 1272  
 Gruter, Janus 1274; 1135  
 Grynaeus, Simon 1262  
 Guarino da Verona 1268
- Haupt, Moriz 1282  
 Heinsius, D. and N. 1272  
 Henry, James 1292  
 Herder, J. G. 1280  
 Heyne, C. G. 1280  
 Holland, Philemon 1273  
 Hroswitha 1252  
 Hübner, Emil 1284  
 Huët, P. D. 1271
- Isidore of Seville, St 1249
- Jahn, Otto 1282  
 John of Salisbury 1253;  
 (2) J. the Scot ('Erigena') 1251  
 Jones, (Sir) William 1275
- Kennedy, B. H. 1292  
 Key, T. H. 1292  
 Krebs, J. P. 1282
- Lachmann, Karl 1282; 1189, 1195 n.  
 Lagomarsini, G., 1277  
 Lambinus, Dionysius 1265  
 Landriani, G. 1259  
 Lane, G. M. 1292  
 Latham, R. G. 18  
 Linacre, Thomas 1268  
 Lipsius, Justus 1267, 1276  
 Long, George 1293
- Mabillon, Jean 1271  
 Maclean, A. J. 1292  
 Madvig, J. N. 1291  
 Maffei, S. 1135  
 Mai, Angelo 1287  
 Manutius, Aldus and Paulus 1281  
 Marini, G. 1135  
 Markland, Jeremiah 1275  
 Marquardt, J. 513, 522  
 Mayor, J. E. B. 1292  
 Melanchthon, Philipp, 1269; 1298  
 Merivale, Charles 1293  
 Middleton, J. H. 1293  
 Mommsen, Theodor 1284; 25, 28, 220, 303, 322 f, 384, 540, 1133, 1135 (p. 763)  
 Montfaucon, Bernard de 1278  
 Morhof, D. G. 1274  
 Müller, Lucian 1282  
 Munro, H. A. J. 1292  
 Muretus, M. A. 1263  
 Myers, F. W. H. 1292
- Nägelsbach, K. F. 1282  
 Nettleship, Henry 1292

- Nicolas V. 1260  
Niebuhr, G. B. 1284; 140  
Nizolius, M. 1263, 1277
- Olivieri, A. 1135  
Orelli, J. C. 1281
- Palmer, Arthur 1292  
Pantagato, O. 337  
Panvinus, O. 1135  
Parker, J. H. 1293  
Peerlkamp, Petrus Hofmann 1289  
Pelham, Henry 1293  
Perizonius, J. 1272  
Petrarch (Francesco Petrarca) 1256  
Piccolomini, Aeneas Sylvius 1269  
Pithou, Pierre 1265  
Planūdēs, Maximus 1183  
Poggio Bracciolini 1258; 1135  
Politian, A. 1260  
Pomponius Laetus 1261
- Quicherat, L. M. 1288
- Ramsay, William 1292  
Remi of Auxerre 1251  
Reuchlin, Johann 1269  
Ribbeck, Otto 1282  
Riemann, Othon 1288  
Ritschl, Friedrich 1282  
Robortelli, Francesco 1263; 1135  
Salmasius, Claudius 1271  
Savile, (Sir) Henry 1273  
Scaliger, Julius Caesar 1265  
Scaliger, Josephus Justus, 1266; 1135  
Scheller, I. J. G. 1280  
Schleicher, August 1283  
Sellar, W. V. 1292  
Sergi, Giuseppe 18 f, 1135  
Sigonius, Carolus 1263  
Smetius, Martin 1135  
Soltan, W. 107  
Stephanus, R. and H. 1264  
Strada, Famianus 1270
- Sylvester II 1252
- Theodore of Tarsus 1250  
Traube, Ludwig 1286
- Umpfenbach, F. 1282  
Unger, G. F. 107, 109  
Ussing, J. L. 1291
- Valla, Laurentius 1260  
Victorius, Petrus 1263  
Vida, M. G. 1263  
Vincent of Beauvais 1253  
Vittorino da Feltre 1261  
Vossius, G. F. 1272
- Wickham, E. C. 1292  
Wilkins, A. S. 1292  
Willems, Pierre 1290  
Winfrid of Crediton 1250  
Wölfflin, Eduard 1282  
Wolf, F. A. 1280
- Zumpt, K. G. 1282

# IV. INDEX OF LATIN WORDS AND PHRASES.

*A* 1096 (p. 739); = *Aulus* 1106  
*ab urbe condita* 135  
*ābāci* 269, 286, 813, 820, 1070  
*ābies* 82  
*Aborigines* 23 ff, 27 ff, 32, 36  
*Abraxas* 870  
*abrōtōnon* 95  
*absinthium* 95  
*ācanthus* 94 (p. 83), 822  
*accensi uelati* 707  
*accipiter* 61  
*accusator* 376, 485  
*ācēr* 82  
*achras* 89 (p. 76)  
*acies*, varieties of 733  
*ācīpenser* 73  
*ācōnītum* 95  
*acta* 393; documents 1105, 1120-32  
*Actia* 791  
*actio* and *iudicium* 478  
*actio familiae erciscundae* 429; *fiducia* 440; *per iudicis postulationem* and *per manus iniectionem* 453; *per pignoris capionem* 455; *per conditionem* 456; *iudicati* 469; 472; *furti* 472; *legis Plaetoriae* 472; *in rem* and *in personam* 478; *certae pecuniae* and *incertae, bonae fidei* and *stricti iuris* 461, 472, 478; *ciuilis, poenalis* and *annalis* 478  
*actor* 806  
*actuaria, scriptura* 1095  
*actuarius* 743  
*actus* (*quadratus* and *minimus*) 678  
*adlectio* 387  
*adoptio* 418 f  
*ādor* 86  
*adrogatio* 418  
*adserere* 452  
*adsertor libertatis* 420  
*aduertores* 552  
*aduersaria* 445  
*aduocatus* 486

*aediles* 321, 365, 551, 553; *cēreales* 385, 779, 786  
*aegritas* 412  
*aera*, chronological 125  
*aerarii* 313, 364, 707  
*aerarium* 129, 388, 503; *Saturni* 498; *militare* 391, 503, 512, 517; *sanctius* 512  
*aerarius* 1101  
*aes rūde* 687; *signatum* 687; *equestre* and *pararium* 708; *horaearium* 708  
*aescūlus* 82  
*Afra anis* 65  
*Africanae* (sc. *bestiae*) 56  
*ager Gallicus* 338; *publicus* 339 f, 423, 426, 476, 506, 1109; *Romanus* 312 f, 336, 344, 423; *Campanus* 351, 506, 508; *stellatis* 351; *quaestorius* 506 f; *stipendiarius* 507; *a censoribus locatus* 507; *priuatus* 567  
*agger* 736; the Roman 42  
*agmen pilatum* 732; *quadratum* 732  
*agnāti* 228, 231  
*agnatio* 32, 422, 429 f  
*agōnes* 778, 785; varieties of 798 f  
*agrimensōres* 1071  
*ala* 264; *alae* 726 f, 813, 816, 829; *milliariae equitatae* 726, 728; *quingenariae* 726  
*ālāpa* 420  
*alarii* 714 f  
*Alcaica, carmina* 1232  
*alcēdo* 63  
*alces* 58  
*alga* 85  
*alimentationes* 515  
*allium* 91 (p. 80)  
*alnus* 82  
*ālōz* 99 (p. 88)  
*ālūta, nigra* 243  
*āmārācus* 93  
*amaranthus* 85  
*Ambarualia* 207  
*ambubaiae* 799  
*ambulātionēs* 745, cp. 801

*ānellus* 85  
*amictus* 240  
*āmōnum* 99 (p. 88)  
*amphitheatrum* 804  
*amphōra* 679, 1119  
*ampulla* 247  
*amysdāla* 90 (p. 78)  
*anaphōra* 1026  
*ānas*, pl. *ānātes* 68  
*Ananis (Annaeus)* 1106  
*ancile* 34  
*Ancyranum, Monumentum* 45, 212, 380, 521, 524, 1127  
*andrachnē* 91 (p. 80)  
*andrōn* 264  
*ānīthum* 93  
*angina* 1075  
*anguilla* 73  
*anima*, soul 1050  
*animus, mens*, principal part of the soul 1050  
*ānisum* 93  
*annales* 134, 140; *maximi* 131  
*annōna* 626; *annonae, curatores* 514  
*annūli* (archit.) 820. See *ānūlus*  
*anser* 68  
*antae* 816 f  
*antemensores* 736  
*antepagmenta* 855  
*antiquo* 317  
*Antoninianus, argenteus* 699  
*ānulus* 226 p. 177; 244; 863; 872  
*-anus*, added to cognomen 222  
*āpex* 1099  
*āpis* 76  
*āpium* 91 (p. 80)  
*āpōdes* 62  
*āpōdōtērion* 247, 833  
*āpōphēgē, āpōphēsis* 813, 820  
*appellatio* 316, 367  
*Aqua Claudia* 46, 1109; *A. Iulia* 45 f, 825, 1109; *Aquae Apollinares* 1114  
*aquila* 61  
*aquilljēri* 750  
*arānea* 74



- aratores* 625  
*aratrum* 259  
*arbitrari*, used by witness 488  
*arbūtus* 90 (p. 78)  
*arcari* 743  
*architātri* 1088  
*architectura* 808 ff  
*arcuballista* 740  
*ardēla* 66  
*ārēa*, threshing-floor 260  
*argentarii uascularii* 631  
*Argeorum sacraria* 41  
*āries*, engine 740  
*arma lusoria* 795  
*armārium* 297  
*armillae* 244, 748  
*aromātārii* 1087  
*argūtes* 706  
*arra* 226  
*Aruāle*, carmen 269, 1212;  
*A. fratres* 778, 1128  
*āruudo* 98  
*as* 676, 682 ff, 686 ff, 703;  
*libralis* 689  
*asarōtōs oecōs* 897  
*Asclēpiōdēa*, carmina 1230  
*āsilus* 76  
*aspārāgus* 91 (p. 80)  
*aspis* 72  
*assēres* 252  
*assidui* 707; settled men 313  
*astrāgal* 820; 828  
*Atellanae* 806  
*atri* (*dies*) 114  
*atriplex* 91 (p. 80)  
*atrium* 227; varieties of 263  
*attāgēn Iōnicus* 65  
*audītōrium* 800, 804  
*āuēna* 86  
*augūres* 553  
*Augustalis*, *seuir* 534, 558  
*Augustalium*, *ordo* 534  
*Augustus* (*mensis*) 108  
*avis incendiaria* 62  
*aulaca* 269, 807  
*eurei* 700  
*auriflēs* 631  
*aurigae* 794  
*auspex nuptiarum* 226;  
*auspices* 356  
*auspiciū impetratiūm* and  
*oblatiūm* 356  
*auxiliarii* 715  
*auxiliūm* 376  
  
*B* 1096 (p. 739)  
*baccar* 85  
*Bacchanalia* 230, 559; *Bac-*  
*chanalibus*, *scium de* 1123,  
1134, 1214  
  
*bālānus* 99  
*ballaena* 60  
*ballista* 740  
*balneae* 833  
*balsānum* 99  
*balteus* 238, 731  
*barbūtōs* 292  
*bāstīca* 816, 823, 832  
*bātis* 93  
*bellaria* 248  
*bellum* 706—753  
*beneficiarii* 749  
*bestiarii* 796  
*bēta* 81  
*bīdens*, hoe 259  
*bīdental* 219  
*Bipontinae*, *editiones* 1279  
*bīremis* 770  
*bīrōta* 662  
*bison* 58  
*bissextum* 121  
*blatta* 76  
*bōletus* 92  
*bombyx* 76  
*boucrānia* 829  
*brācae* 731  
*brassica* 91  
*breues breuiantes*, law of  
1213  
*būbūlus* 58  
*būbo* 61  
*būcīllae* 731  
*bullā* 225  
*būris* 259  
*Burrus* for *Pyrrhus* 1091  
(p. 730), 1215  
*buxus* 83  
  
*C* 1096 (p. 739); = *Gaius*  
1091, 1106; = 100, 1097;  
in subtraction 1097  
*caelator* 1101  
*caepa* 91 (p. 80)  
*caesura* 1224 n.  
*cālānus* 98, 298  
*calcēdīlariū* 630  
*calceus* 243  
*calcūlator* 286  
*calcūli*, pebbles 286  
*caldarium* 247, 833  
*cālīgae* 243, 731  
*caltha* 85  
*calunnia* 472, 486  
*cāmēlōpardālis* 58  
*cāmēlus* 58  
*Camillus*, bronze 835  
*canmārus* 74  
*Campanus*, *ager* 1109  
*campidoctores* 745  
*cāndāae* 747  
  
*cānālis* 821, 828  
*cancer* 74  
*candēlābra* 269  
*candidati Caesaris* 386  
*canis* 56 (p. 49); a shark 73  
*canna* 98  
*cannābis* 86  
*cantica* 779, 807  
*cano*, *canto*, *cantito* 1216  
*cantor* 807  
*cāpella* 58  
*cāpillāris* 85  
*capilli*, *incompti* 241  
*cāpīte censi* 741  
*cappāris* 93  
*capra* 58  
*caprifīcus* 89  
*caprimulgus* 63  
*capsae* 297  
*capsarius* 281  
*capsis* 1214  
*captatores*, legacy-hunters 231  
*carbāsus* 97  
*carbunculi* 244  
*cardūelis* 62  
*cārēum* 93  
*cārex* 85  
*cārīca* 89  
*Carmentalia*, the 1074  
*carpāsa* 95  
*carpentum* 252  
*carpinus* 82  
*carrūca dormītōria* 667  
*cāsta* 84, 99  
*Cassianum*, *foedus* 568 n.  
*cassis* 731  
*cassila* 62  
*castānēa* 90  
*castella* 547, 739  
*castōrēum* 57  
*castra stātīna* 737  
*catapulta* 740  
*cāthēdra* 269, 280  
*cattus* 56  
*cāuēa* 801, 804  
*caulis* 91  
*caupo* 667  
*caupōnae* 667; *c.* or *tabernae*  
252  
*causae* 288  
*cedrus* 82, 89 (p. 76)  
*cellae* 813, 816 f, 829 ff  
*cēna* 248  
*cēnācula* 265  
*ensor* 364, 387  
*centaurēa* 84  
*centēsima rerum uenaliūm*  
391, 512  
*centēsimatio* 745  
*centumuirī* 458 f

centuriae 313, 706  
centurio 752; *classicus* 774  
centussis 685  
cērāsus 89 (p. 76)  
cercopithēcus 55  
Cērēalia 779  
ceri poculum 215  
cērīntha 84  
certa pēcūnia 461, 471  
ceruus capreolus 58  
charta 293  
chōrāgii, *procurator summi*  
807  
chria 288  
chōrium 94 (p. 83)  
cicāda 76  
cicer 87  
cichōrēum 91 (p. 80)  
ciconia 66  
cicuta 95 (p. 85)  
cimex 75  
cināra 91 (p. 80)  
cinctus Gābinus 238  
cingulum 226, 239, 731  
cinnamum 99  
cippus in the Forum, *inscr.*  
1002; *cippi terminales*  
1109  
circumvallatio 740  
cīstarii 668  
cīstariorum (or *iumentario-*  
*rum*), *collegia* 252  
cīstum 252, 662  
cistae 1114  
cithāra 292  
citrus 89 (p. 76)  
ciuis 415, 546; *c. sine*  
*suffragio* 375; *c. Romanus*  
*sum* 376  
ciuitas 546; *sine suffragio*  
546 f  
ciuitates foederatae 395, 714;  
*c. liberae* 395, 549; *sti-*  
*pendiariae* 550  
clābūlae angāriae 662  
classes 772 f; *political* 313;  
34, 772  
classarii, *marines* 772, 774 f  
classis, *composition of the*  
*Roman* 34; *varieties of*  
*Italian and provincial* 772  
Claudius, Clodius 1215  
clepsydra 245  
clientes 306  
clīnāmen 1049  
clīpeus 708, 731  
CN = Gnaeus 1091, 1106  
coccum 96  
cochlea 80  
cochlear 673, 679

codex accepti et expensi 445  
codices 295, 301, MSS 1174 ff  
coemptio 32, 226, 417, 424  
coercitio, *magisterial com-*  
*pulsion* 857  
cognatio 422, 429 f  
cognitor 470  
cognomen 222, 312  
cohors, = *court-yard* 257;  
*cohortes urbanae* 380, 730,  
1089; *praetoriae* 380, 728;  
*alariae* 714 f, p. 463 n.;  
*praetorianae* p. 463 n.;  
*auxiliares* 715, p. 463 n.,  
723; *ciuium Romanorum*,  
*uoluntariorum, ingenuo-*  
*rum* 724; *uigilum* 730;  
*classicae* 773  
collegae 316  
collegia 202, 228, 559 f, 720,  
1087; *tenuiorum or iune-*  
*raticia* 559, 561; *illicita*  
560; *of scribibi and dor-*  
*mientes* 561  
collocatio, *lying-in-state* 227  
cōlēcāsia 91 (p. 81)  
cōlōnia 564 ff; 344, 394, 573,  
580, 714; *peregrinorum*  
566; *ciuium Romanorum*  
543, 567 f; *Latina* 568  
cōlōnus 565  
cōlūter 72  
cōlumbae 64  
cōlumbaria, *sepulchral cham-*  
*bers* 228  
cōlūmna rostrata 1108  
cōlus 629  
cōmissatio 250  
cōmītia centūriata 311, 313,  
315, 317, 325, 330, 334 f,  
337, 343, 357, 371;  
*curiata* 309, 317; *tributa*  
317, 323, 328, 331, 335;  
*tribuniciae potestatis* 383  
cōmītiales, *dies* 113  
commendatio 386  
commentarienses 749  
commentarii 128  
commercium 624 ff; *iūs com-*  
*merci* 415, 423  
commōdatum 444  
communes loci 288  
comparatio 358  
compēndiatio 486  
Compitalia 540  
compitum 200  
complūuium 263  
conceplūuae, *fēriae* 116  
concha 78  
conciliabulum 545

concilium prouinciāe 212; *c.*  
*plebis* 317, 323 f, 325 f,  
331, 335, 377  
conclamatio 227  
condemnatio 469, 472  
condictio 456  
confarreatio 32, 86, 226,  
417  
confusionis, *annus* 119  
conger 73  
congiaria 521 f  
coniuatio 741  
connubium or conubium 226,  
415, 747  
conquistatores 741  
conscripti, *members of the*  
*Senate* 554  
consortes 429  
constitutio 393; *pl. (of the*  
*emperor)* 1124  
Consualia 778, 783, 786  
consulares (or *iuridici*) 370,  
479  
consules 330, 385, 551  
contabulatio 238  
contarii 723  
contio 319, 357  
contributi, *men not citizens*  
*or incolae* 552  
controversiae 288  
contus 731  
conubium. See *connubium*  
conuentio in manum, *mar-*  
*riage without* 226  
conuentus 583; *matronarum*  
233  
cōquina 1209  
cōriandrum 93  
cōriarius 630  
cornicines 227, 707  
cornicularii 749  
cornix 62  
cornu 292  
cornus 89 (p. 76)  
corona ciuica 748; *coronae*  
*castrenses, mūrāles, uallā-*  
*res* 748  
correctores 557  
corrigiae 243  
coruus 62; *boarding-bridge*  
757  
cōrylus 90 (p. 78)  
cos. tertium 1109  
costum 99 (p. 88)  
cōthurni 807  
cōturnix 65  
crabro 76  
crātes 259, 740  
crēpundia 225  
cretarius, *negotiator* 639

*critica, ars* 1169 ff; *apparatus criticus* 1187  
*crōdōdīlus* 71  
*crōcus* 84, 96, 809  
*crustae* 825  
*crustūla* 286  
*cryptoporticus* 803  
*cūbicūla* 264  
*cūcullus* 239, 241  
*cūcūlus* 63  
*cūcūmis* 91 (p. 81)  
*cūcūbita* 91 (p. 81)  
*culeīta* 269  
*cūlex* 76  
*cūlina* 264, 1209  
*culleus* 679  
*cūmīnum* 93  
*cūnēus* 733, 804 f  
*cūnicūli* 740  
*cūnicūlus* 57  
*cūpēdinariū* 628  
*cūpressus* 82  
*cūprum* 642  
*cūra annonae* 513 f  
*cūralium* 80  
*cūratēla* 422  
*cūrātor* to examine local accounts 557; *cūratores riparum* 399; *uiarum* 649; *c. tribuum* 505  
*curculio* 77  
*curio* 311  
*currus* 662  
*cursiua, scriptura* 1095, 1132  
*cursores* 668  
*cursus honorum* 360, 1133; *c. publicus* 662; *c. uelox* 662; *clābūlāris* 662  
*cycnus* 68  
*cyma* 828  
*cynōcēphālus* 55  
*cystis* 88  
  
*D* 1096 (p. 740); = *Decimus* 1106  
*d* final 1123, 1212, 1214  
*damma* 58  
*damnatio ad metalla* 494  
*Dea Dia* 778  
*deambulare* (Cato) 1216  
*dēcemūtri stilitibus iudicandis* 326, 333, 369, 458, 462, 551  
*dēcimatio* 745  
*declamatio* 288  
*decolatio* 493  
*decreta* 1122-24  
*dēcūmae* 508, 513  
*dēcūmani* 500  
*dēcūriae* 487, 706

*dēcūrio* 726; pl. 496, 553  
*decursiones* 745  
*decussis* 685, 687  
*dedicatio* 206  
*dedicūci* 415  
*deductio* of a bride 226  
*dei* 201  
*dēlatio* 376, 391, 486  
*dēlātor* 486  
*dēlicta*, obligations springing from 447  
*Delphica mensa* 269  
*Delphini, editiones in usum* 1271  
*delphīnus* 60  
*dēmīnūtio cāpitis* 416  
*dēnārius* 690, 695  
*dentālia* 259  
*dēportatio* 494  
*dēpōstūm* 444  
*designator* at a funeral 227  
*dextrarum iunctio* 226  
*dī indigētes* 197, 203, 205; *Manes*, 1204; *nouensiles*, 203  
*dico, dicto, dictito* 1216  
*dictamnus* 95  
*dictator* 305, 320, 551  
*didascālia* 807  
*diem dicere and prodicere* 378, 486  
*dies lustricus* 222, 225  
*diffarreatio* 417  
*digiti* 676  
*dilectus*, levy 741  
*dioeceses* 583  
*Diōmēdēae aues* 68  
*diploma* 662; pl. 1124  
*diptycha consularia* 1125  
*dispensator* 539; pl. 743, 749  
*dissignatores* 805  
*diuerbium* (or *deuerbium*) 807  
*diui imperatores* 392  
*diuinatio* 485  
*do, dīco, addīco* 409  
*dōlia* 1119  
*dōliāre, opus* 631, 1118  
*dōlon* 764  
*dōlus mālus* 466  
*dōmīnium* 426  
*donāria* 1077  
*donātium* 743  
*dūōūtri* 553, 556; *sacris faciundis* 202, 333; *nauales* 369, 755  
*duplarii* 743  
*duplicarius* 726  
*dūpondius* 687, 693 f  
  
*E* 1096 (p. 740)

*ēbēnum* 99 (p. 88)  
*ēbōrariū* 631  
*ēbūlus* 83  
*ēchēnēis* 73  
*ēchinus* 80, 813, 820 f  
*ectypae gemmarum scalpturae* 871  
*edictum* 357, 393; *perpetuum* 357, 414, 457; *provinciale* 581  
*edīcīci iudices* 487  
*editiones principes* 1261 n.  
*ēdītor spectaculorum* 794 f  
*ēlēphas* 58  
*ēlōgia* 1106, 1108  
*emancipatio* 419 f  
*emblemata* 897 f  
*empton* 825  
*emptio, uenditio* 446  
*empton familiae* 432 f  
*endōtercīsus* 113, 220  
*ēpūlum louis, ēpūla sacra* 786  
*ēquīles* 308, 314, 337, 342, 529, 706; *equo priuato* and *equo publico* 329, 342, 708; *illustres* 532; *extraordinarii* 714, 726, 728, 732; *lēgionis* 726; *singulares* 726, 729; *singulares Augusti* 729, 750  
*Equirria* 220, 778, 783, 786  
*equorum probationes* 786  
*equus* 59  
*ergastilum* 540  
*ērīnācēus* 55  
*ērūca*, caterpillar 76; plant 91  
*Etrusca, disciplina* 219  
*euectio*, passport 662  
*ēuēcati* 742; *Augusti* 718, 722, 728  
*ēuēcatio* 722, 730  
*exactum ad Castoris* 1111  
*exceptatores* 749  
*exceptio* 466  
*exēdrae* 264, 833  
*exercitatores* 745  
*exercitus* 706 ff, 745; members of the *comitia centuriata* 315; *subitarius* (or *tumultuarius*) 741  
*exilium* 494  
*expensilatio* 456  
*exsecrationes* 1132  
*extrad* (extra) p. 828  
*extra ordinem*, procedure 477  
*extraordinarii* 714, 736  
  
*F* 1096 (p. 740)  
*fāba* 87

*fabri* 631; *tignarii* 707  
*fābūlas*, *agere* 806  
*factiones* 794  
*fāgus* 82  
*fālārctae* 740  
*falces mūrāles* 740  
*fāmilia* 423; *rustica* 539;  
*urbana* 539; pl. 306, 795  
*fānum* 206  
*far* 86, 248  
*fas* 409  
*fascēs* 359  
*fasciae* 269, 731, 820  
*Fasti* 132, 136 ff, 1101; *Capitolini* (*Consulares*) 130 f,  
135 f, 1130; *Triumphales*  
130, 1130; *anni Iuliani*  
1131  
*fastus, dies* 113, 220, 409  
*fauces*, entrance corridor 265  
*fautores* 806  
*fāxo* and *fāxim* 1214  
*Februarius* 108  
*februū* 220  
*fefaked* 1091, 1210  
*fēlis* 56  
*fēnicūlum* 93  
*fēnus unciarium* 104  
*fercūla* 248  
*fēretrum* 227  
*fērentārii* 709  
*feriae* 778; *publicae* 121, 124;  
*Ioui* 220; *dēnīcales* 227  
*ferūla* 98, 282  
*festūca* 420  
*fētiales* 202  
*fiber* 57  
*fībula* 237, 239, 244, 1091,  
p. 731  
*ficālum* 68  
*ficēdūla* 62  
*ficus* 89  
*fīdēlicommissa* 439 f, 477  
*fīdēlicommissarius* 439  
*fides* 292  
*fīdūcia* 440  
*figlinūm, opus* 631  
*figūlus* 631  
*filix* 85  
*fīnītōres* 1071  
*finium, tutor* 200  
*fiscus* 503 f, 662  
*fistūla* 292; *fistulae plumbeae*  
1115  
*fistulatores* 631  
*Flāmen Dialis* 202, 211, 226;  
*flāminēs* 31, 202  
*flāminica Dialis* 231  
*flammeum* 226  
*Flōralia* 779, 783, 792

*fōcāria* 747  
*fōcus* 264  
*foedus* 371; *aequum* 549;  
*iniquum* 549; *foedera* 1120  
*foenum* 88  
*folis* 247, 743  
*forēpes* 238  
*formica* 76  
*formūla* 457, 465; *pētītoria*  
471  
*fōrum* 544, 736  
*fossa Augusti* 771; *Drusi* 772,  
*Fourio(s)* = *Furius* 1094  
*fraxīnus* 82  
*frequentē, saepius, saepissime*  
1026  
*frīgīdarium* 833  
*fringilla* 62  
*frumentarii* 662, 722; *frum-*  
*mentarius canon* 521; *frum-*  
*mentariae leges* 513, 515  
*frūmentationes* 513  
*frūmentūm* 86 f  
*fūcus* 96  
*fulcra* 269  
*fulgūrātōres* 219  
*fullo* 629  
*fundītōres* 723  
*fundus* 257, 426  
*fungus* 92  
*funus indictiūm* and *trans-*  
*latīciūm* 227; *fūnēra acerba*  
227  
*fustuarium* 745  
*fusus* 629  
  
*G* 1091, 1096 (p. 740)  
*Gādītanae* 799  
*gaesum* 21  
*Gaius* and *Gāia* 226  
*galba* 76  
*galbānum* 99 (p. 88)  
*gālēa* 708, 731  
*gālērī* 807  
*gallina* 65  
*gāntae* 68  
*gārūm* 73  
*gāuīa* 68  
*gausāpe* 239; *gausāpa* 633  
*gemmae* 859 ff  
*gēnista* 83  
*gēnius* of the emperor 392  
*gens* 222 f, 421, 429; *gentes*  
305 f, 527; *maiores* 308;  
*minores* 308, 706  
*gesta maiorum* 799  
*gladiatōrum, familiāe* 795  
*glādīus* 708, 731; fish 73  
*glandes plumbeae* 1113  
*glis* 57

*gossypium* 97  
*grācūlus* 62  
*Grāecus ritus* 210  
*grammaticus* (or *litteratus*)  
274, 283, 287 f  
*grassatores* 666  
*grex*, troupe of actors 806  
*grillus* 76  
*grōma* 736; *g.* and *grōmā-*  
*tici* 1071  
*grus* 66  
*grylli* 868  
*gubernator* 761, 774  
*gustus* 248  
*gymnasia* 1078  
  
*H* 1096 (p. 740)  
*habitor* corrupted into *abilior*  
1172  
*Hadriani* 65  
*halcyōn* 63  
*harpastum* 247  
*haruspices* 219, 750  
*hasta* 459, 708, 710, 712,  
717, 731; *caelibaris* 226;  
*uēlītāris* 713  
*hastarius, praetor* 459  
*hastatī* 711 f, 752  
*hēctōstōylōn* 801  
*hēdēra* 83; *hederae distin-*  
*guentes* 1100  
*hēlīces* 822  
*hellēbōrus* 95  
*hēmīna* 679  
*hēmīlōiai* 762, 765  
*hendecasyllabi* 1235  
*hērēditas* 429, 435, 437  
*hērēdium* 431  
*hērēs* 435, 437; *ex asse,*  
*secundus* or *tertius* 436;  
*suus* 438; *fīdūciarius* 439  
*hexameter* 1224-29  
*hexaphōron* 252  
*hexēreis* 762, 767, 776  
*hibiscus* 97  
*hippopotamus* 58  
*hīrūdo* 74  
*hīrundo* 62  
*hīstrio* 1204  
*honestiores* 496  
*horae* 245  
*hordeum* 86  
*horrea*, warehouses 625, 627  
*hospitium publicum* 667  
*hostia* 208  
*hostis* 415  
*hyacinthus* 85, 244  
*hyaena* 56  
*hydraulus* 292  
*hydrus* 72



*hypocausta* 833  
*hypodidascalus* 280  
*hypotrachelium* 813  
*hystrix* 57  
*I* 1096 (p. 740); = *uncia* 1098  
*iambica, carmina* 1233  
*iānuā* 264  
*ibis* 66  
*ichneumon* 56  
*Idus* 105, 110, 220  
*ientaculum* 248  
*ilex* 82  
*-illa, -ina, women's names* terminating in 222  
*imagines, portrait masks* 227, 264, 837  
*imaginifera* 750  
*imperatiuae, fēriae* 116  
*impluvium* 263  
*imperator, the name* 380, 748  
*imperium* 303; *domi* and *militiae* 355, *infinitum aequum* 765; *i. i. maius* 766  
*inauguratio* 206  
*inaures* 244  
*incilia* 255  
*incomma* (or *encomma*) 741  
*index* 297  
*indigentia* 203  
*indumentum* 240  
*infamia* 472, 495  
*insignia* 748  
*instaurare* 208  
*instauratio* 787  
*instilla* 240  
*institor* 627  
*instrumentum* 1110  
*insula* 1) (*domus* 268  
*intercalare* 111  
*intercalaris, dies* 123; *mensis* 108 f, 119  
*intercessio* 367, 408  
*interdictio aqua et igni* 378, 483  
*interdictum* 475 f  
*intermundia* 1050  
*interregnum* 140, 305, 368  
*interrex* 305, 368  
*intestabilis* 434  
*intubum* 91  
*inula* 91 (p. 80)  
*inulcus* 58  
*iouxmenta* (= *iumenta*) 1092  
*irpex* 259  
*irrogare nullam* 317  
*isodidmum* 825  
*itinērvaria* 650  
*iudices and arbitri* 461 f

*iudicium certae pecuniae* 471;  
*i. domesticorum* 497  
*iugērum* 687  
*iuglans* 90  
*Iulius (mensis)* 108  
*iumentarii* 668  
*iuncus* 85  
*Iuniores* 707, 709  
*iunipērus* 82  
*Iunius (mensis)* 108  
*Iuppiter Fōretrius* 199, 203  
*iuridici* 385  
*iuris consulti* 411, 464; procedure in iure 427, 463 ff, 477; *iura rusticorum praediorum* 428  
*ius* 409; *anuli aurei* 863; applicationis 306; *auxilii* of *tribunus* 322; *ciuile, gentium* and *praetorium* 412, 414 f, 427, 429, 459; *conubii* 415; *ediciendi* and *agendi cum plebe* 357, 393; *gladii* 398, 496, 492; *hospitii* 667; *imaginum* 837; *Italicum* 423, 507; *i. and iudicium* 479; *Latinum* 415; *Latinum uetus* 546, 568; *Latinum nouum* (*duodecim coloniarum*) 568; *latinum, stillicidii, igni immittendi* 428; *Papirianum* 405; *postliminii* 416; *promocationis* 546; *Quiritium* 423; *sacrum* or *diuinum* 197 ff  
*iynx* 63

*K* 1096 (p. 741); = *Kaeso* 1106

*Kalendae* 105, 110, 220

*L* 1096 (p. 741); = 50, 1097; = *Lucius* 1106

*labrusca* 89

*lācerta* 71

*lācīniae* 238

*Lāconicum* 247, 833

*lactūca* 91

*lacunae* in *inscr.* 1133; in *MSS* 1197

*lācūnāria* 829

*laena* 239

*lāgōpus* 65

*lāna, cotton* 97

*lancea* 731

*lānificā* 229, cp. p. 747, l. 26

*lānii* 628

*lāpāthum* 91 (p. 80)

*lapidaria, lingua* 1104

*lapidarius* 1101

*lāpis niger* 53; *l. mānālis* 204

*Lāres* 264; *compitales* and *familiares* 226

*lārix* 82

*Latina, lingua* 1209 ff

*Latinitas* 341, 375, 394

*lātrina* 264

*lātus clāuus* 531

*laudatio, funeral panegyric* 227

*laurus* 82

*lecti, couches* 249

*lecticae* 252, 668

*lecticarii* 252, 539

*lectio senatus* 350

*lectisternium* 210

*lectus funēbris* 227; *l. genialis* 263; *l. tricliniāris* and *cubicularis* 269

*lēgare* 432

*lēgāta* 439

*lēgārvius* 435

*lēgāti* 369, 371; *lēgōnum* 721, 751; *Augusti* (*pro praetore*) 721, 751

*lēgātio libera* 662

*lēgātum* 435, 437

*lēges* 1121; *rēgiae* 405

*lēgio* 706; titles of *legiones* 720; *classica* 761

*lembi* 762

*Lēmūria* 204, 226

*lens* 87

*lentiscus* 83

*leo* 56

*lēpus* 57

*Lēuāna* 225

*leuga, Gaulish* 651

*lex* 317, 335, 450; *Acilia*

*repetundarum* 342, 460,

485, 1101, 1121; *Aebutia*

449; *Aelia* 338; *Aelia*

*Sentia* 415, 420; *Aemilia*

328; *Antonia de Termes-*

*sensibus* 549; *Aternia*

*Tarpeia* 685; *Aurelia* 349;

*Calpurnia repetundarum*

338, 349, 456; *Cānūleia*

327; *Cincia de donis et*

*muneribus* 411, 436, 448;

*Clōdia* 559; *Cornelia* 1121;

*Falcidia* 440; *Flāmīnia*

338; *Fūfia* 338; *Fūfia*

*Cānīnia* 420, 534; *Gābīnia*

351, 765; *Hortensia* 335,

527; *Ilcia* 42, 112, 141 f;

*Iulia de ciuitate* 341, 546;

*Iulia de collegiis* 559; *Iulia*

- de maritandis ordinibus* 231; *Iulia iudiciaria* 478, 488; *Iulia municipalis* 251, 551, 554, 806; *Iulia theatralis* 809; *Iunia Norbana* 415; *Licinia de sodaliciis* 487, 559; *Licinia* of 367 B.C. 506; *Licinia Mucia* 341; *Maenia* 335; *Mamilia* 351, 372; *Octavia* 513; *Ogulnia* 112, 333; *Oppia* 230; *Ovinia* 350; *Pabia Poppaea* 231, 441; *Pinaria* 112; *Plautia Papatia* 341, 546, 692; *Poetelia* 425; *Pompeia* 341; *Publia* on *patrum auctoritas* 334; *Publilia Volterronis* 323; *Roscia Othonis* 805; *Rubria* 546, 1121; *Rupilia* 371; *Sempronia* 513; *Servilia iudiciaria* 346; *Silia* 456; *Thoria* 506; *Tullia de ambitu* 487, 784; *Valeria de prouocatione* 316, 319 f; *Valeria Horatia* 335; *Villia Annalis* 360; *Vicionia* 230, 437, 439; *agraria* 324; *collegii* 563; *coloniae* 565, 574; *curiata de imperio* 309, 318, 364; *de repetundis* 585; *iudiciorum publicorum* 557; *legis actiones* 449 ff; *lex parieti faciendo* 1122; *provinciae* 581; *quintanucenaria* 472; *regia Vespasiani* 393; *sacrata* 322; *Salpensa, Malacitana* etc. 1121; *templorum* 206, 1126  
*liber*, a book 293  
*liberos*, tollere 225  
*libertini* 224, 312, 375, 761  
*libertus* 306, 375  
*Libitina, Venus* 227  
*libitinarii* 227  
*libra* 681 f, 686  
*librarii* 743, 749  
*libri lintei* 131, 293  
*libripens* 226, 424, 433  
*licia* 629  
*lictores* 318  
*ligo* 259  
*ligula* 679  
*ligusticum* 91 (p. 81)  
*ligustrum* 83  
*lilium* 94 (p. 83)  
*limes Germanicus* 739; *Racticus* 739  
*linum* 97  
*literae quadratae* or *lapi-dariae* 1094 (p. 737)  
*liticen* 227  
*litis contestatio* 468  
*litra* 686  
*litterator* 273, 283  
*lituus* 292  
*locatio, conductio* 446  
*locupletes* 707  
*locusta* or *lucusta*, cray-fish 74; *locust* 76  
*lodices* 633  
*lolum* 86  
*lolligo* 79  
*lorica* 708, 731  
*lotus*, nettle tree 82  
*lotus*, vetchling 88  
*lucar* 788  
*lucius* 73  
*ludi* 778 ff; *circenses* 794; *extraordinarii* 782f; *fun-ebres* 783; *honorarii* 791; *natalicii* and *natalis imperii* 791; *plebeii* 779, 786 (2), *privati* 781, 791; *saeculares* 148, 791; *scenici* 778, 781, 783, 786; *seculares* 796; *stiltini* 780, 791; *uolui* 782; *Apol-linares* 363, 779, 782 f, 786 (4), 788; *Augustales* 791; *Capitolini* 782; *Cere-ales* 786; *Florales* 786 (6); *Graeci* 792; *Latini* 792; *Martiales* 791; *Megalenses* 779, 786; *Palatini* 791; *Parthici* 791; *Romani* 786, 788 etc.; *Troiae* 785, 788; *Victoriae Caesaris* and *Vict. Sullanae* 780, 786  
*ludiones* 800  
*ludorum, cura* and *curatores* 365, 805  
*ludus litterarius* 273; *L. quintanus* 745  
*lumbricus* 74  
*lunula* 243  
*lupinum* 87  
*lupus* 56; fish 73  
*luscina* 62  
*lustratio* 200, 209, 745  
*lustrum* 212; *condere* 364  
*lutra* 56  
*lutum, weld* 96  
*lyra* 292  
*lyrica, carmina* 1230  
*M* 1096 (p. 741); for *mille* 1097; = *Marcus* 1106  
*/W* (not *M'*) = *Manius* 1106  
*macellum* 625, 628  
*males* 56  
*maenianum* 265  
*magister bibendi* 250; *m. equitum* and *populi* 305, 320, 349; *m. of publicani* 500  
*magistratum, solitudo* 139  
*magnarii* 627  
*maestras* 392, 495  
*malobathrum* 99 (p. 88)  
*malua* 91 (p. 80)  
*malum aureum* 89; *m. gra-natum* 89 (p. 75)  
*malus, Punica* 89 (p. 75); *m. Appiana* 89 (p. 76); *m. Medica* 89 (p. 77)  
*manceps* 500, 649, 662  
*mancipatio* 423 ff, 428  
*mandatum, agency* 446  
*mandra, ora* 95  
*mantipulus* 313  
*manni*, Gallic cobs 252, 668  
*manticularii* 627  
*manum consilere* 452  
*manus, marriage accom-panied by* 416 ff, 421 f, 427; cp. 226  
*mapa* 794, 840  
*margaritae* 78, 244  
*marmorarius* 1101  
*matéria medica* 1086  
*matèries morbi* 1079  
*mathemàtica, astrologers* 1072  
*matrona* 306, 416  
*medica* 88  
*medici* 1073, 1087; *legionum* and *ordinarii* 1089; *medi-corum, scholae* 1087  
*medicina Romana* 1073 ff  
*Megalèsia* 779, 783, 792, 800  
*melagris* 65  
*melilotus* 85  
*mellisphyllum* 84  
*membrana* (or *pergamēna*) 293 f  
*Mennônides duces*, 67  
*menologia rustica* 1132  
*mensae secundae* 248, *m. citrae* 248  
*menses, Roman* 108, 220  
*mentes* 736  
*mensurae* 672 ff  
*mentha* 93  
*mercatores* 625 f  
*meriditatio* 246  
*metalla* 633, 1117  
*metrica, ars* 1218 ff  
*Microtegni* 1083

*miliaria* 651, 1109  
*militēs classici* 761  
*millium* 86  
*miluus* 61  
*minus* 227, 807  
*Mineruāle, munus* 283  
*minium* 1101  
*missio in possessionem* 470,  
 477; discharge, 741; a  
 heat in a race 794  
*mōdius* 679  
*mōla salsa* 208  
*mōnēdūla* 62  
*mōnērēs* 770  
*mōnūlia* 244  
*mōndētrōs* 59  
*mōndpōdūla* 269  
*monumentalis, scriptura* 1094  
*monumentum heredem non*  
*sequetur* 1106  
*mōrus* 89  
*mos maiorum* 271, 405, 354  
*mūgil* 73  
*mullus* 73  
*mūlio perpetuarius* 668  
*mulsum* 248  
*multa, maxima* 357  
*mulus* 59; *Marianus* 732  
*munera* 546, 778; *persona-*  
*rum* 556; *patrimonii* 556;  
*gladiatorum* 782, 784, 786;  
*munerum indicio* 745  
*municipes* 375, 552  
*municipium* 546, 558, 565;  
 actors in *municipia* 806  
*mūrēna* 73  
*mūrex* 13, 78  
*mus Alpinus* 57  
*musca* 76  
*musculi* 740  
*muscus* 85  
*mūstium opus* 893 ff  
*musmo* 58  
*mustēla* 56, 73  
*mutuum* 444  
*myrica* 83  
*myrōdālānum* 99 (p. 88)  
*myrrha* 99  
*myrtus* 83  
*mytilus* 78  
  
*N* 1096 (p. 741)  
*nablium* 292  
*naeniāe* 227  
*nāpus* 91  
*narcissus* 94 (p. 83)  
*nardus* 99 (p. 88)  
*nasturtium* 91  
*natrix* 72  
*Naturalis Historia* 1068 f

*nāuālia* 754  
*nāuicūlarīi mātrīni* 663 f  
*naues* 754—777; *nāuis aper-*  
*ta, constrata, tecta* 764  
*naumachiae* 785, 797  
*nautae* 664, 761  
*nēfastus, dies* 113, 220  
*nēgōtiales* 510, 529, 625  
*nēpa* 74  
*neque—neque* 1214  
*nexum* 425, 442  
*nītēdūla* 57  
*nomen* 222—224; *nomen* 222;  
 deferre and accipere 485  
*Nonae* 110, 220  
*nōtarii* 749  
*notiones* 1058; *innatae* 1055  
*nōuendiale sacrificium* 227  
*noxa (noxae deditus)* 419,  
 425  
*numeri* 727, 750; detach-  
 ments 722  
*numina* 199, 201, 203, 207,  
 215  
*nummus* 696, 1211  
*nuncupatio* 425, 433  
*Nundina, the goddess* 225  
*nundinae* 116 f  
*nundinum* 117; *trinum n.*  
 378  
*nux Graeca* 90  
  
*O* 1096 (p. 741)  
*obligatio* 442  
*obnuntiatio* 356  
*obstetrices* 225  
*ocreae* 708, 731  
*octophōron* 252  
*oecus* 264  
*ōfellae* 248  
*ōlēa* 89  
*oleaster* 89  
*olla* 227  
*ōlōr* 68  
*ōlūs atrum* 91 (p. 81); *ōlōra*  
 248  
*ōnāger* 740  
*ōndrōtālus* 68  
*operarii, farm hands* 539  
*optimus maximus* 204  
*optiōnes* 750, 752  
*ōpus testāceum, rētticūlatum*  
 and *quadratum* 825; *in-*  
*certum* 825, 829; *albarium*  
 827; *signinum* 894; *sectile*  
 895; *tessellatum* 896, 898;  
*uermicūlatum* 897 f  
*orbes, tables* 241  
*orca* 60  
*orchestra* 804 f

*ordinarii* 752  
*ordo, of the Senate* 554;  
 military terms, *ordines*  
*primi* 752; *ordinis ademp-*  
*tio* 745  
*ornamenta* 807  
*ornus* 82  
*ōryx* 58  
*ōryza* 99 (p. 88)  
*ōs resectum, from a corpse*  
 227  
*ostiaris* 539  
*ostrēa* 78  
*ōtis* 66  
*ōtus* 61  
*ōuatio* 748  
  
*P* 1096 (p. 741); = *Publius*  
 1106  
*pacta praetoria and legitima*  
 448  
*paedagōgus* 279  
*paenūla* 238 f, 296  
*pāla (ligna)* 259 f  
*pālaestra* 276  
*pālātia* 667  
*pālātūrus* 83  
*palla* 240  
*pallium* 794  
*palma* 94 (p. 83)  
*pālūdamentum* 359, 731  
*pālumbes* 64  
*pānicum* 86  
*panis farreus* 226; *panem*  
 et *circenses* 799  
*panthēra* 56  
*pantomimus* 799  
*pāpauer* 86  
*pāpilio* 76  
*pāpūrus* 98, 294  
*passer* 62; fish 73  
*pastināca* 91  
*pātāgium* 240  
*Pātāuinitas* 1216  
*paterfamilias* 200 ff, 305, 310,  
 405, 416 ff, 421, 429, 481,  
 1073  
*patres* 306; *patrum auctōri-*  
*tas* 318, 334  
*patria potestas* 32, 416, 418 f  
*patricii* 30, 32—4, 306, 527 ff  
*patrimōnium* 431; *Caesaris*  
 504  
*patronus* 306, 416, 420, 486,  
 554  
*pardus* 56  
*Pārentalia* 204, 561  
*Pārilia* 135, 207, 209, 254  
*parma* 713, 731  
*parra* 66

*paricidii*, quaestores 311  
*participes*, shareholders 501  
*pāuo* 65  
*pecten*, scallop 13; quill 292;  
 comb 629  
*pectōrale* 731  
*pectuarii* 625  
*pecūnium* (castrense) 416, 541,  
 627  
*pecūnia* 423, 685, 688, 702;  
*crēdita* 444; *incerta* 788  
*Pēdani* 554  
*pēdarii* 374  
*pēdicūlus* 75  
*pēdissequus* 279, 539  
*pēdites singulares* 726  
*pelliones* 630  
*pēloris* 78  
*pentameter* 1228  
*perdix* 65  
*perduellio* 309, 362, 367  
*perduellionis dādūiri* 311,  
 362  
*pēregrini* 415, 521 f, 775  
*pergula* 280  
*peracti* 807  
*peristylum* 264  
*pernae* 58  
*persēa* 90 (p. 78)  
*perstium* 90 (p. 78)  
*perticae* 260  
*pes* 676, 687; *mōnētalis* 675  
*phālērae* 748, 750  
*pharmācōpōlae* 1087  
*phaselus*, *phasēdus* 87  
*phāsianus* 65  
*Philologus* 1240; *philologo-*  
*rum historia* 1237 ff  
*philosophia Romana* 1047 ff  
*phoenicopterus* 68  
*physētēr* 60  
*piacula* 207 f, 219  
*pica* 62; *pīcus* 63  
*pīcēla* 82  
*pictura* 873 ff  
*pignus* 444; *pignora*, *caedere*  
 and *capere* 357  
*pīla* 247; dummy 796  
*pīlani* 712  
*pilleus* 227  
*pīlum* 710 ff, 717, 731  
*pīlus* 752  
*pīnus* 82  
*pīper* 99 (p. 88)  
*pīrus* 89 (p. 76)  
*pīscīna* (or *natatio*) 247, 833  
*pīstor* 847; *candidarius* 628  
*pīsum* 87  
*plādīlā* 66  
*plādānus* 82

*plaustellum Punicum* 260  
*plebei* 30, 496  
*plebiscitum* 317, 330, 335,  
 388, 1121; *Atinium* 350  
*plebs*, the 307; *urbana* 530,  
 533; *quae frumentum*  
*accipiebat* 533; *plebēs*  
 555; *concilium plebis* 377,  
 485  
*plēctrum* 292  
*plinthus* 813  
*plūtēus*, back of couch 269;  
*plūtēi*, book-cases 297;  
 mantlets 740  
*plūdiū* 813, 816, 826, 830 f  
*Poeninus (Iupiter)* 1107  
*pollices*, subdivisions of a  
 'foot' 676  
*pollinctores* 227  
*pōlypus* 79  
*pomoerium* 40, 46, 48, 316,  
 355, 1109, 1215  
*pompa* 786  
*pōmum* 89  
*pondus* 681; *pondera et men-*  
*surae* 672—684, 1111  
*pontifex maximus* 202, 226,  
 357; *pontifices* 111, 202,  
 211, 553  
*Popilianum, miliarium* 1109  
 (p. 751)  
*pōpīna* 1209  
*poplifugium* 115  
*pōpulus* 82  
*-por*, slaves' names ending in  
 224  
*porcus praecidāneus* 208  
*porphyrio* 67  
*porrum* 91 (p. 80)  
*porta dēcīmana* 736 f; *p.*  
*Libitīnensis* 795  
*portōria* 372, 500, 502, 511  
*possessio* 426 f, 460, 475;  
*bonorum* 430, 434  
*possessores* 510  
*posticum* 264  
*postscaenium* 804  
*pōtestas* (*par*, *maior* and  
*minor*) 316, 355  
*praecinctions* 804  
*praeco* 227, 360, 807  
*praecōqua* 89 (p. 76)  
*praefectura* 309; *annonae*  
 399, 547, 557; *castrorum*  
*s. lēgiōis* 751  
*praefectus* 396 ff, 755; *aerarii*  
 225; *Capuam Cumas* 369,  
 385; *urbī*, *praetorio*, *uigil-*  
*um* 311, 385, 397 f, 479,  
 490, 492, 497; *classis* 532,

760, 766; *annonae* 513 f,  
 532; *iure dicundo* 346;  
*uehicularum* 662; *sociorum*  
 714; *castrorum* 721; *orae*  
*maritimae* 725, 766; *praet-*  
*torio* 728; *alarum* 773  
*praeficae* 227  
*praefurnium* 833  
*praefudicium* 467  
*praenomen* 222  
*praescriptio* 466  
*praententura* 736, 739  
*praetexta* (fabula) 904  
*praetextati* 554, 805  
*praetor* 316, 425, 551; *ur-*  
*banus* 357, 363, 487, 786;  
*peregrinus* 363, 412; *praet-*  
*oris edicta* 415  
*praetōria* 667; *navis* 762  
*praetōriana, uia* 736  
*praetōrium* 316, 717, 728,  
 736  
*praetura urbana* 408  
*praeuāricatio* 486  
*prandium* 246, 248, 281  
*prāsii* 244  
*primipilus* (*primus pilus*  
*prior*) 752  
*primus pīlus secutorum* 795  
*princeps*, the title 383  
*princeps senatus* 333  
*principales*, inferior officers  
 749, 753  
*principalis, uia* 736 f  
*principes* 711 f, 752  
*priuatūs* = *reus* in political  
 trials 360  
*prīuilegia ne irroganto* 325  
*pro magistro* 500  
*proconsulare imperium* 382 f  
*prōcūlator* 391, 396, 470, 504,  
 511; head of house slaves  
 539  
*prōdigia* 219  
*programmata* 807  
*progymnasmata* 288  
*prōlētarii* 313, 707  
*prōnāds* 813, 816 f  
*prōnūba* 226  
*pronuntiatio tituli* 807  
*propnigum* 833  
*propugnacula* 764  
*propugnatores* 764  
*prorogatio imperii* 338, 373  
*prosaenia* 804  
*proscissio*, first ploughing 259  
*proscriptio bonorum* 469  
*provincia* 575 ff; 358, 550;  
*aquaria* 366; alphabetical  
 list of *provinciae* 590 ff



*prōductio* 316, 325 f, 357,  
359, 376, 378, 480 f  
*prunus* 89 (p. 76)  
*psalterium* 292  
*pseudisōdōnum* 825  
*psittacus* 63  
*publicani* 352, 364, 499 ff,  
506 ff, 511 f, 529, 537, 663;  
*Londinienses* 1118  
*pugillares* 295  
*pūlex* 75  
*pulmentarium* 252  
*pulpitum* 280, 800, 804  
*puls* 248, 628, 744  
*puluinar* 210, 794  
*pulus Pūtilianus* 812  
*purpura* 78  
*pūteal* 219  
*pyrēthrum* 95  
*Pyrricha* 790

*Q* 1096 (p. 741); = *Quintus*  
1106

*quadrae* (archit.) 820  
*quadrantes* 693; 247  
*quaesitor* 363, 485  
*quaestio* 346  
*quaestionarii* 749  
*quaestiones* 338, 349, 363,  
365, 378, 388, 398, 480  
*quaestores aerarii* 358, 556;  
*urbani* and *Ostiensis* 366;  
*sacri palatii* 479; *classici*  
366, 756  
*quaestorium* 736  
*quarto quoque anno* 122  
*quattuorviri* 553  
*quercus* 82  
*querquedula* 68  
*quincunx* 711  
*quindēcemviri* 211  
*quingennales* 553 f  
*quinguerēmēs* 762 f  
*quintana, uia* 736 f, 745  
*cura* (= *cura*) 1091

*R* 1096 (p. 741)  
*rādīus*, shuttle 629  
*rādīx* 91  
*raeda* 252; *rēda* 662  
*rāna* 70  
*rāpum* 91  
*rastrum* 259  
*recei* (= *regi*) 1092  
*rēcupētores* 460, 462  
*rēda* 662; *raeda* 252  
*redemptores* 649  
*rēgio* 130, 202  
*rēgīfūgium* 115, 220  
*rēlēgatio* 494 f

*rēligio* 198, 200  
*religiosa, loca* 206  
*religiosi (dies)* 114  
*rēmiges* 761, 775  
*rēpētundae* 486  
*rēpōtia* 226  
*rēpūdium renuntiare* 226  
*res mancipi and nec mancipi*  
423, 425 f, 428  
*rescriptum* 393  
*retenturae, uia* 736 f  
*rex* 202; *sacrorum* or *sacri-*  
*ficulus* 305, 324, 333  
*rhētor* 283, 288  
*rhombus* (turbot) 73  
*rīca* (or *rīcīnium*) 240  
*Rōbīgalia* 216, 254; cp.  
*rūbīgo* 86  
*robur* 82  
*robus, rufus* 1209  
*rōgare legem* 317  
*rōgatio* 317; *Mamilia* 346  
*rōgus* 227  
*rōrarii* 709  
*ros mārīnus* 85  
*rōsa* 94  
*rostrata, columna* 823  
*rūbēta* 70  
*rūbīgo* (or *rōbīgo*) 86  
*rūbus* 90 (p. 78)  
*rūpīcāpra* 58  
*ruscum* 83  
*rūta* 93  
*rutrum* 259

*S* 1096 (p. 741); = *semis*  
1098; *S* or *SP* = *Spurius*  
1106

*Sābīna, herba* 99 (p. 88)  
*sacchāron* 99 (p. 88)  
*sācellum* 206  
*sacer esto* 322  
*sacer, locus* 206  
*sacramentum* 741; *actio per*  
449 ff  
*sacrificium* 207  
*sacrosancta potestas of tribu-*  
*nus* 322, 367  
*saeculum* 147 f, *ludi saecu-*  
*lares* 148; *acta sacrorum*  
*saecularium* 1129  
*saepia* 79  
*sāgittarii* 723  
*sāgularis, uia* 737  
*sāgum* 731  
*salamandra* 71  
*sālar* 73  
*sālīnae* 625  
*sālīunca* 99 (p. 88)  
*sālīx* 82

*salmo* 73  
*salutatio* 246  
*sambuca* 292  
*Sapphica, carmina* 1230  
*sarcophagi* 847 f; marriage  
scene sculptured on Roman  
226; death scene on 227  
*sātīra* 1266  
*sātīreia* 93  
*Saturnalia* 540  
*Saturnius, numerus* 1218  
*scaenae, varieties of* 807  
*scalprum* 1101  
*scādrābaeus* 77; gem 859  
*scārūs* 73  
*scazōn* 1235  
*scholae* (or *scolae*) 743  
*scilla* 95 (p. 85)  
*scintphes* 76  
*sciūrus* 57  
*scōlōpax* 67  
*scōlōpendra* 74  
*scomber* 73  
*scorpio* 74, 740  
*scribēdo arxuerunt* 374  
*scrīnia* 297  
*scriptūlum* 695 f  
*scriptura, (1)* writing 1094 f  
1103, 1136 ff; (2) a tax 500  
*scripturarii* 506  
*sculptura* 835 ff  
*scūtīca* 282  
*scūtum* 34  
*sella* 269, 280; *gestatoria*  
252; *cūrūlis* 359  
*senatus* 370 ff, 554; *s. consul-*  
*tum* (and *decretum*) 310,  
366, 374, 388, 1121; *ulti-*  
*mus* 340, 345, 373, 484;  
*Pegasianum* 440; *de*  
*Aphrodisiensibus* 549  
*sēnīōres* 707, 709  
*sēps* 72  
*SER* = *Seruius* 1106  
*sērīca* 76  
*serpyllum* 84  
*seruare de caelo* 356  
*serui* 537; their names 224  
*seruus poenae* 494  
*seruitutes* 428  
*sēsāmum* 86  
*sestertius* 691, 693, 695 f  
*sestertium* 1214  
*sēuīri* 558  
*SEX* = *Sextius* 1106  
*sextarius* 679  
*sextūla* 695, 699  
*sicīlicus* 1099  
*sigīllum* 864  
*signācula* 1102, 1115

- signifēri* 750  
*Signinum, opus* 269  
*signum* 722, 750  
*silicernium* 227  
*siliqua* 87, 680  
*siliurus* 73  
*similis* 55  
*simulacra* (εἰδωλα) 1050  
*stināpi* 93  
*singularis, an orderly* 749  
*siparium* 807  
*siser* 91  
*stella* (= *tabella*) 488  
*smāragdi* 244  
*socci* 243, 807; *lūtei* 226  
*societas, partnership* 446  
*socii nomenque Latinum* 715;  
*s. nauales* 761  
*sōdāles Augustales* 212  
*sōlāria* 245  
*sōleae* (or *sandālia*) 243, 249  
*solpugae* 74  
*solutio legibus* 361, 373  
*sorbus* 89 (p. 76)  
*sorex* 55, 57  
*sortes* 1126  
*sortitio* 358  
*SP=Spurius* 1106  
*sparsiones* 804  
*spāthae* 723, 731  
*spectavit, spectatus* 1112 (4)  
*spēcūlātōres* 662, 750  
*spongia* 80  
*sponsalia* 226  
*sponsio* 442 f, 471, 475;  
*betting* 794  
*sportula Saturnalia* 283  
*squilla* 74  
*stactē* 99  
*stadium* 677  
*stātōres* 662; *Augusti* 730  
*stellio* 71  
*stilius* 286, 298  
*stipendium* 509 f, 742  
*stipulatio* 443  
*stōla* 239 f  
*stōlarchus* 773  
*strāgula* 269  
*strēna Kalendaria* 283  
*strigilis* 247  
*strix* 61  
*strūtio* 66  
*sturnus* 62  
*suādere legem* 317  
*sūber* 82  
*Sublicius, pons* 42, 624  
*subscriptions* 1244  
*subscriptores* 376, 485 f  
*suffragium ferre* 317  
*sui iuris* 421  
*siūdūstaurilia* 207  
*sus* 58  
*syngrāpha* 445  
*T* 1906 (p. 741); = *Titus*  
1106  
*tabellarii* 662, 665; *tabel-*  
*lariae naues* 662  
*tābernae* 264, 627, 667;  
*mēdicāe* 1087 f  
*tablinum* 264  
*tābūla Iliaca* 280  
*tabularii publici* 225  
*taenia* 74  
*talpa* 55  
*tarandrus* 58  
*Tārentini, ludī* 148  
*taxis* 82  
*tēgūlae* 825, 1118  
*tēla* 629  
*tēmo* 259  
*templum* 206, 219; 810, 813,  
816 ff  
*tēpidarium* 247, 833  
*tērēbinthus* 82  
*terguersatio* 486  
*tessera hospitālis* 667, 1112  
(3); *t. lusoria* 1112 (2)  
*testamentum* (cālātis cōmitiis  
and in *procinctu*) 431; *per*  
*aes et libram* 433; *testa-*  
*menti factio* 434  
*testūdo* 69; (= *lyra*) 292;  
*t. ārtētaria* 740  
*tetrādo* 65  
*textrina* 629  
*theatrum* 800 ff  
*thyia* 89 (p. 76)  
*thymbria* 84  
*thymum* 84  
*thynnus* 73  
*TI* or *TIB* = *Tiberius* 1106  
*tibia* 292, 799; varieties of  
807  
*tibicen* 292, 807; pl. 227,  
707, 799; monument of  
835  
*tigris* 56  
*tilia* 82  
*tinea* 76  
*tinus* 83  
*tituli, inscriptions* proper  
1105; *honorarii* 1108;  
*operum publicorum* 1109;  
*sepulcrales* 1106; *sacri*  
1107  
*tōga* 237 ff, 531, 629; *uirilis*  
212, 225, 805; *praetexta*  
226 f, 238, 359; *pulla* 238;  
*crētata* 238; *picta* 794  
*tonsores and tonstrinae* 631  
*torcular* 257  
*tormenta* 740  
*tornus* 631  
*torpēdo* 73  
*torques* 748  
*tōrus* (archit.) 813, 820 f,  
828  
*trūbēa* 237  
*tremissis* 700  
*tresviri capitales* 369, 481;  
*mōnētales* 704  
*triarrii* 711 f  
*tribulum* 260  
*tribūnal* 800, 805  
*tribunica potestas* 381, 383,  
402  
*tribunus* 367; *plebis* 321,  
327; *sacrosancta potestas* of  
367; *tribuni aerarii* 312,  
505; *t. celerum* 308, 706;  
*t. militaris* 321; *militum*  
706, 751  
*tribus* 309; *urbanae* and  
*rusticae* 312, 364  
*tridūtum* 312, 372, 504 f;  
*ciuium Romanorum* 507;  
*soli* and *capitis* 509 f  
*triclīnia* 249, 264  
*trirēmes* 763  
*tritricum* 86  
*trivium* and *quadrivium*  
1255  
*triumphator* 212  
*triumphorum, acta* 1130  
*trōchilus* 67  
*tropaeum Alpium* (Turbia)  
1109  
*trȳgōn* 73  
*tūba* 292, 795  
*tūber, truffle* 92  
*tūbēres, jujubes* 89 (p. 76)  
*tumultus causa uoti* 782  
*tūnica* 239; *recta* 226; *in-*  
*terior* 240  
*turdus* 62  
*turres* 764; *ambulātoriae* 740  
*tursio* 60  
*turtur* 64  
*tūtēla* 421 f, 477  
*tutores* 421, 447  
*typi, reliefs* 856  
*V* 1906 (p. 742); (=5) 1097  
*uācantia, bona* 429  
*uācatio* 741, 752  
*uādes* 451  
*uādāmōnium* 451, 485  
*uādētādīnāria, 753, 1081,*  
1089

*nallum* 736, 739  
*uannus* 260  
*ubi tu Gaius, ego Gaia* 226  
*uēhicūla meritoria* 668  
*uēhicūlatio* 662  
*uēlārium* 834  
*uēlites* 706, 711 f  
*uelle* used as future auxiliary 1026  
*uēlōciter* used for *mox* 1026  
*uēnātionēs* 785 f, 796 ff  
*uēratrum* 95  
*uerbēna* 94 (p. 83)  
*uernae* 537  
*uersipelles* 56  
*uersurae procurentes* 804  
*uertrāgus* 56  
*uērūtum* 708, 731  
*uespa* 76  
*uesperna*, evening meal 248  
*uespertilio* 55  
*uestibulum* 246, 264  
*uexillarii* 722, 742, 750  
*uexillatio* 722, 1103  
*uexillum* 722, 750  
*uia* 649 ff; *priuata, publica, militaris, uicīnalis, curatores uiarum* 649; *Aemilia* 3, 653; *Appia* p. 38 n., 252, 651 f; *Augusta* 655; *Aurēlia* 5, 653; *Campana* 10, 1128; *Cassia* 653; *Dōmītia* 654; *Egnātia* 654; *Flamīnia* 4, 42, 653; *Lābīcana* 227; *Lātina* 9, p. 38 n.; *Popīlia* 652,

inscr. on p. 731; *Portuensis* 626; *Postūmia* 653; *Sacra* 40; *Sālāria* 6, 7, 624; *Vālēria* 8, 653  
*uīburnum* 83  
*uīcēsima manumissionum* 372; *libertatis* 512; *hērēditātum* 391, 512  
*uīcēsimatio* 745  
*uīci* 45; city wards 533, 547; *magistri* of 533; rural communes 547  
*uīcia* 87  
*uictoriatu* 698  
*uīgiles* 45, 397, 730, 750, 1089  
*uīgīliae* 245  
*uīgintisexuīri* 369, 385  
*uilla urbana and rustica* 257  
*uīlicus* 257, 539 f  
*uīnālia* 107, 254  
*uindex* 420, 452  
*uīndicatio* 478  
*uīndīciae* 452  
*uīndicta* 420  
*uīneae* 740  
*uīnum* 250; *natum, diffusum* 1119  
*uīōla* 85  
*uīpēra* 72  
*uis ciuilis or quotidiana* 475  
*uisum* 83  
*uīlis* 89; *alba* 85; vine-staff 752  
*uītūlus mārinus* 56  
*uīuerra* 56

-*ulla*, women's names terminating in 222  
*ulmus* 82  
*ultero tributa* 364  
*ūlūla* 61  
*umbilicus* 296  
*umbo*, boss 238, 731  
*unciae* 676, 682, 686, 1098  
*uncialis, scriptura* 1095 (p. 739)  
*unguentarii* 1087  
*uolēnum* 89 (p. 76)  
*uolūmen* 295  
*uōmer* 259, 687  
*ūpūpa* 63  
*ursus* 56  
*urtica* 97; *marina* 80  
*ūrūca* 76  
*ūrus* 58  
*ustrina* 227  
*usucāpio* 426 f, 428  
*usus* 32, 226  
*uti rogas* 317  
*utrīcūlārius* 292, 630  
*uulgāris, scriptura* 1103  
*uulpes* 56  
*uultūr* 61  
*uulua* 58  
*X* 1096 (p. 742); = 10, 1097  
*xysti* 833  
*Y* 1091, 1096 (p. 742)  
*Z* 1091, 1096 (p. 742)  
*zōthēca* 264













NORTH CENTRAL COLLEGE

R 913.37SA5

C001

A COMPANION TO LATIN STUDIES 2D ED. CA



3 2611 00090580 8



08-AAC-998

